

The English Language
1878

Esas.
Librarian

Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library
Govt. of West Bengal

þære stowe þe is gecueden *Portes* a place which is called *Portsmouth*,
 muða [and sona land namon] and [and they soon landed,] and they
 [þær] ofslogon anne, giongne Bret- [there] slew a young British man, a
 tise monnan, swiðe æðelne monnan. very noble man.

. Now *Portus* must have been the name of *Portsmouth*, long anterior to A.D. 501, inasmuch as it was a Latin, and not an Angle, word; whilst the landing of a man named *Port* at a place already called *Portus* is improbable. Just, however, as one *Port* hits upon a spot with a name like his own, one *Wihlgar* does the same.

A.D. 530.—Her Cerdic and Cynric genamon *Wihthe* Ealand, and ofslogon feala men on *Wihl-garas-byrg*.

A.D. 534.—Her Cerdic [se forma West-Sexana cyng] forðierðe, and Cynric his suna [feng to rice, and] ricsode forð xxvi wintra, and hie sald on hiera twæm nefum Stufe and *Wihl-gare* [eall] *Wihl-Ealond*.

A.D. 544.—Her *Wihlgar* forð-ferðe, and hiege mon bebyrgde on *Wihl-gara-byrg*.

A.D. 530.—This year Cerdic and Cynric took the island of *Wight*, and slew many men at *Wihl-garas-byrg*.

A.D. 534.—This year Cerdic [the first king of the West-Saxons,] died, and Cyndric, his son, [took to the kingdom,] and reigned from that time twenty-six winters; and they gave the [whole] island of *Wihl* to their two nephews, Stuf and *Wihl-gar*.

A.D. 544.—This year *Wihlgar* died, and they buried him in *Wihl-gara-byrg*.

Now *Wihl* is the Anglo-Saxon form of the name of *Vectis*=Isle of *Wight*, a name found in the Latin writers long anterior to A.D. 530; and *gar* is a form of the word *wære* (or *wæras*)=*inhabitants*. Yet the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle makes it a man's name.

The following instances, less decided than the previous ones, are, nevertheless, worth noticing.

A.D. 477.—Her côm Ælla to Bretten-lond and his iii suna, *Cymen*, and *Wlenring*, and *Cissa*, mid iii scipum, on þa stowe þe is nemned *Cymenesora*, and þær ofslogon monige Walas, and sume on floame bedrifon on þone widu þe is genemned *Andredes-leage*.

A.D. 477.—This year Ælla, and his three sons *Cymen*, and *Wlenring*, and *Cissa*, came to the land of Britain with three ships, at a place which is named *Cymenes-ora*, and there slew many Welsh, and some they drove in flight into the wood that is named *Andredalea*.

These names are the names of geographical localities, Lancing, Keynsor (Cymenesora) and Chichester (Cissan-ceaster); which is suspicious: becoming more so when we find that the second element in Cissan-ceaster (if not in Cymenes-ora also)* is Latin.

§ 14. However, it is not a history of Great Britain that I am writing, but one of the English language. Hence the whole question as to the literary and historical value of the early writers is too wide. The extent to which they are sufficient or insufficient to prove certain specific facts is all that need be investigated. One of these is the date of A.D. 449, for the *first* landing of the first ancestors of the present English. That certain Germans settled on a certain part of the coast of Kent is the simple, straightforward part of it. That they were the *first* who did so is quite a different matter: and it should be recognized as such. To date the German occupancy from A.D. 449, and (holding that it began with the exploits of Hengest and Horsa) to maintain that no Angle had landed upon any part of England before, is to lay too little stress upon the *Notitia*, and too much upon Beda. To do so is not only to attempt the notoriously difficult proof of a negative, but it is to attempt it in the face of conflicting evidence. That such conflicting evidence may be objected to I, by no means, deny. The settlements on the Saxon shore may have been ephemeral. The authorities of Beda may have had better opportunities of knowing the archæology of their respective districts than we suppose. Beda himself may have exercised a judicious criticism. The more, however, I attend to Beda's narrative, the fewer reasons I find for allowing his text to be final and conclusive. It is, indeed, not unlikely that the authority of, even, Albinus, Daniel, and others has been claimed in behalf of statements which have no such grounds to rest on. That a notice like that of the death of

Horsa may have been found on Kentish soil (though the localities which, at the present moment, bear the names of *Hengistbury* and *Horsted* are in Hampshire and Sussex) is probable enough. So—allowing for the difference of locality—may other local stories. What, however, is the basis for the general statements as to the nationality of Hengest, the difference between the Jutes and the Saxons, the Saxons and the Angles, and the like? Not that of Beda himself? Not, always, that of Beda's informants? Strictly speaking it is only for the *Ecclesiastical* history of the times subsequent to the conversion of Ethelbert that any of the authorities above-mentioned are referred to. For the times anterior to the introduction of Christianity and the foundation of the See of Canterbury the reference is to the old writers in general.

Translation.

From the beginning of this volume to the time when the nation of the Angles received the religion of Christ, I have learned what I lay before you from the writings of those who have gone before me, as I have collected them from this quarter or that. From that time, however, to the present, &c.

In the original.

A principio itaque voluminis hujus usque ad tempus quo gens Anglorum fidem Christi percepit, ex priorum maxime scriptis, hic inde collectis ea quæ promeremus didicimus. Exinde autem, &c.

The continuation has already been given. It tells us for what he consulted Albinus—for what Nothelm—for what Daniel &c.

Of the *priorum scripta* one was the *Liber Querulus de Excidio Britannię* of Gildas, a scholar of St. Iltutus, and a monk of Bangor, who died and was buried at Glastonbury. He states that he was born in the year of the battle of the Mons Badonicus, which no investigator makes earlier than A.D. 493, and which some bring down to A.D. 516.

Let Gildas have written as early as A.D. 540, let him

have been the brightest luminary of the British Church ; and let the literary culture which attended the early Christianity of our island have been ever so high, we still find that, even for ordinary history, his opportunities whether of time or place, are utterly insufficient to make his statements conclusive.

Mutatis mutandis, this applies to Beda. Add to Gildas a life of St. Germanus and some few classical writers, and we have the authorities for the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Whatever may have been the learning of the author, and however much he may have been the luminary of his age, his materials are neither better nor worse than this. Indeed, it is only for Northumberland that Beda is, himself, answerable. The real evidence is that of Albinus, Daniel, the monks of Lestingham, &c.

A measure of the value of their evidence is to be found in their account of the Roman Wall. Gildas says it was built against the Scots and Picts, and that its date was the fifth century ; and Beda follows him. The inaccuracy of this statement is well known. What warrant have we that it is the only inaccuracy in the works in which it occurs ?

CHAPTER III.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—PARTS FROM WHICH IT WAS INTRODUCED.—METHOD OF TREATING THE SUBJECT.—EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.—WRITERS SUBSEQUENT TO THE ANGLE CONQUEST.

§ 15. THE first introduction of a German population on the soil of Britain is one thing : the evacuation of the island by the Romans another. This latter event may safely be referred to the middle of the fifth century, say

A.D. 446. By fixing on a particular year we get precision: the reason why this one in particular is chosen being as follows:—It was the year of the third Consulship of Ætius; and to Ætius, according to Gildas, the following letter was addressed.

Translation.

To Ætius, thrice Consul, the groans of the Britons. The Barbarians drive us to the sea. The sea drives us back to the Barbarians. Between these arise two sorts of death. We are either slaughtered or drowned.

In the original.

Agitio, ter Consul, gemitus Britannorum. Repellunt nos Barbari ad mare, repellit nos mare ad Barbaros; inter hæc oriuntur duo genera funerum: aut jugulamur, aut mergimur.—*Historia Gildæ*, xvii.

But the whole century was an age of darkness, confusion, and barbarism: and so was the century which followed. For accurate narrative, careful chronology, and authentic geography, the investigator looks in vain. Nevertheless his investigations are practicable. Certain approximate results may be obtained—certain approximate results, if nothing better.

§ 16. There are no notices of Britain of the exact date of the Angle invasions. Neither are there any such notices of the Angle part of Germany in the days when the Angles conquered England. But there is something of the sort. There are sketches (to say the least of them) of both countries for certain times anterior to the Angle epoch; and there is something better than sketches for the times that follow it.

In these we have the testimony of certain writers; testimony which constitutes our *external* evidence. How it is to be used will be considered as we proceed. At present, it is enough if due attention be given to the word *external*.

•In contrast to this, under the general title of *internal*

evidence, stand certain facts of language, law, customs, and the like; facts which, if every historical notice were annihilated, would still tell us something. Our language, for instance, would show our affinities with Germany.

§ 17. The *external* evidence comes first under notice. The writers fall into two divisions. Some wrote after, some before, the Angle epoch—none (as aforesaid) during it. The later class will be considered first: and it will be considered in reference to Germany rather than to Britain. This is because the question which most especially concerns us is a German one. The English language came from Germany. But from what part? Germany is a large area. Germany, too, contains more than one variety of Germans. To which did our ancestors belong?

§ 18. Of the authorities of Germany, *subsequent* to the Angle emigration, the more important ones date from the reign of Charlemagne and his successors—no earlier. For this period, however, we have a fair amount of authorities—all, however, or nearly all, of which are Frank. The Christianity was Frank. The literature (such as it was) was Frank. The civilization was Frank. It was the Franks who lay between Northern Germany and Rome; so that this is why our information is derived from Frank sources, and this is why our terms are Frank. This, too, is why we must look upon those parts of Europe which contained the Angles and their neighbours as the *Franks* looked at them.

§ 19. In parts to the north and east of their own frontier, the Franks recognized the following divisions:—(1) Slavonia; (2) Denmark; (3) Friesland; and (4) Saxony Proper, or the land of the Angles and Old Saxons. Sometimes Saxony contained parts of Friesland. Sometimes the difference was neglected. It was, at most, but a slight one.

1. *Slavonia*.—Slavonia (a fact of which we must never lose sight) extended *westwards* far beyond its present frontiers. Not only were Brandenburg, Pomerania, Mecklenburg, and Luneburg Slavonic, but Lauenburg as well. South of Hamburg no part of the Elbe was German. The eastern third (at least) of Holstein was Slavonic. The present sites of Lubeck and Kiel were Slavonic. All up to the little river Bille was Slavonic. Roughly speaking, all to the east of a line drawn from Kiel to Coburg was Slavonic.

2. *Denmark*.—Denmark was bounded by the Eyder, or if not exactly by the Eyder, by a line a little to the north of it. From the Treen to the Slie ran, at a later period, the *Dannevirke*, and, earlier still, the *Kurvirke*—the lines of defence against the Germans—the Danish analogues of the Picts' Wall in Britain. Meanwhile, the *Gammelvold* protected the peninsula of Svansö; whilst the *Danischwald* (*Danewood*) lay between Kiel and the Eggenfiord. For anything but minute philology this is enough. For Saxony, as distinguished from Denmark, the Eyder and the Dannevirke give a boundary. Whether, however, there may not have been Angles to the north of Sleswick will be considered in the sequel.

3. *Friesland*.—Roughly speaking, East and West Friesland, along with parts of Oldenburg and Hanover, give us the Frisia of the Franks. The Frisian area, however, will be considered more minutely as we proceed.

4. *Saxony*.—In the eyes of a Frank, Saxony and Friesland contained all those portions of Germany which, partly from a difference of dialect, partly from their paganism, and partly from their independence, stood in contrast to the organized empire of the Carolingians. In the eyes of a Frank, a Saxon was an enemy to be coerced; a heathen to be converted. What more the term meant is uncertain. It was used by the Franks; having

been previously used by the Romans and the Britons. That it was native to the Saxons themselves there is no reason for believing.

§ 20. Saxony fell into two primary and six subordinate divisions. There was the Saxony *beyond the Elbe*, and there was the Saxony *on this side of the Elbe*. The former was called *Nordalbingia*. This is a compound of the word *Nord* (= *North*), and *Albis* (= *Elbe*). The termination *-ing* is a gentile form. It denotes the populations *north of the Lower Elbe* and *south of the Lower Eyder*; in other words, the occupants of the western side of the present Duchy of Holstein.

The Nordalbingians fell into three divisions:—

1. The *Thiedmarsî* or *Thiatmarsgi*, occupants of *Ditmarsch*.

2. The *Holsati*, *Holtzati*, or *Holsætas*, from whom the present Duchy of Holstein takes its name.

3. The *Stormarii*, or people of *Stormar*, to whom Hamburg was the capital.

The Saxons to the *south* of the Elbe lay chiefly in Hanover and Westphalia. They fell into three divisions, of which an unknown poet of the tenth century, himself a Saxon, and quoted as *Poeta Saxo*, thus writes:—

Translation.

The general division contains three peoples;
Known by which Saxony flourished of yore;
The names now remain, the old virtue has gone back.
They call those *Westfalians* who remain
In the Eastern districts; whose boundary is not far
Distant from the river Rhine; the region towards the rising sun
The *Osterleudi* inhabit, whom some
Call by the name *Ostfalian*, whose frontiers
The treacherous nation of the Slaves harasses.
Between the aforesaid, in the mid region, dwell
The *Angrarians*, the third population of the Saxons: of these
The country is joined to the lands of the Franks on the South,
The same is joined to the Ocean on the North.

In the original.

Generalis habet populos divisio ternos ;
 Insignita quibus Saxonia floruit olim ;
 Nomina nunc remanent virtus antiqua recessit.
 Denique *Westfalos* vocitant in parte manentes
 Occidua ; quorum non longe terminus anſe
 A Rheno distat ; regionem solis ad ortum
 Inhabitans *Osterleudi*, quos nomine quidam
Ostvalos alii vocitant, confinia quorum
 Infestant conjuncta suis gens perfida Sclavi.
 Inter predictos media regione morantur
Angrarii, populus Saxonum tertius ; horum
 Patria Francorum terris sociatur ab Austro,
 Oceanoque eadem conjungitur ex Aquilone."

In respect to the Nordalbingians, he writes :—

Translation.

A certain Saxon people, whom from the South
 The Elbe cuts off, as separate towards the North Pole :
 There we call *Nordalbingi* in our country's tongue.

In the original.

Saxonum populus quidam, quos claudit ab Austro
 Albis, sejunctim positos Aquilonis ad axem :
 Hos *Nordalbingos* patrio sermone vocamus.

§ 21. With the boundaries of *Westphalia* we get the boundaries of Saxony on the *south* and the *south-west*. The following notices help us towards obtaining them :—

(1.)

Translation.

While this was going on, there came a holy and learned priest from the nation of the Angles, by name *Leafwin*, to the Abbot Gregory, saying that a command had been given to him from the Lord, in a terrible manner, and in a triple admonition, to help the people to the true doctrine on the boundary between the Franks and the Saxons, along the river *Ysel*, &c.

In the original.

Dum talia gerebantur, venit quidem presbiter (*sic*) sanctus et doctus de genere Anglorum nomine Leafwinus ad Abbatem Gregorum, dicens sibi Domino terribiliter trinā admonitione fuisse præceptum, ut in confinio

Francorum atque Saxonum secus fluvium Isam, plebi in doctrina prodesse deberet, &c.

As the narrative goes on, it states that, in the first instance, an oratory was built for the saint at a place called *Hvilpa*, on the *west* of the aforesaid river; afterwards a church, at *Deventer*, on the *east* of it—a church which the pagan Saxons of the parts around succeeded in burning.

The particular Frank district which the Ysel divided from the Saxon county bore the name *Sal-land*, which has (either rightly or wrongly) been translated *the land of the Sal-ii*, i. e. the famous *Salian* Franks who enacted the famous *Salic* law.

(2.) Due south of Deventer lie Zutphen, Doesburg, and the parts above Emmerich, in the province of Guelderland, and in the arrondissement of Zutphen. In the Carolingian period these formed parts of the Hamaland, the Hamaland being, according to one authority at least, Saxon—"in Sutfeno in pago *Hameland*;—in Duisburg in pago *Hameland*;—in Davindre in eodem pago *Hameland*." Finally, "abbatiam *Attene*" (*Hochetten*, near Emmerich) "juxta Rhenum fluvium in pago *Hamaland*." Word for word, *Hamaland* is considered to be the *land of the Chamavi*.—(See Zeuss in *v. Chamavi*.)

On the Niers, between the Maas and Rohr, lay the land of the *Chattuarii*, *Hazzoarii*, *Attuarii*, or *Hetwære*; occupants of the country about Geizefurt. They were continually attacked by the Saxons: "Saxones vastaverunt terram *Chatuariorum*." (*Annales Scti Amandi*, A.D. 715.) That they were Saxons from the neighbourhood, I infer from the following passages, which make the Chattuarian district a *March* or frontier land—"trado res proprietatis meæ in pago *Hattuaria* in Odeheimero *Marca*, in villâ quæ vocatur Geizefurt, quæ sita est supra fluvium *Nersa*." (See Zeuss in *v. Chattuarii*.)

(3.)

Translation.

This year, our Lord and King, Karl, having collected an army, marched into Saxony, upon a place called *Padersborn*, where, having pitched his camp, he sent out his son Karl, across the *Waser*, in order that such heathens as he found in those parts he might bring into subjection.

In the original.

In hoc anno domnus (sic) rex Karolus collecto exercitu venit in Saxoniā in loco qui dicitur *Patresbrunnas*, ibi castrametatus; inde etiam mittens Karolum filium suum trans fluvium *Wiseram*, ut quotquot isdem partibus de infidelibus suis invenissent, suæ servituti subjugaret.

(4.) Hesse, although other than Frank in respect to its dialects, was Frank in its political relations; but not wholly. The valley of the *Diemel* was half Saxon. There were two *pagi*; one on the Upper *Diemel*, which was Frank, and the other on the Lower *Diemel*, which was Saxon. The former was—

“——Francorum pagus qui dicitur *Hassi*.”—*Poeta Saxo*.

The latter was pagus *Hessi Saxonicus*. Meanwhile, the town of *Wolfsanger* was both Frank and Saxon:—“ad villam cujus est vocabulum *Vulvisangar* quam tunc temporis *Fran̄ci et Saxones pariter habitare* videbantur.”—*Dipl. Carol. Magn.*

§ 22. So much for Saxony and Friesland taken together. Where were they separated? All that need be said at present is, that, according to a special statement, the town of *Meppen* was Saxon rather than Frisian.

Translation.

There is a well-known town in Saxony, named *Meppen*, in the neighbourhood of which the holy priest, on his journey to Friesland, had arrived.

In the original.

Oppidum est in Saxoniā, notum quam plurimus, *Meppen* nominatum, in ejus viciniā, dum antistes sanctus Frisiam pergens, devenerat.—*Vita Sancti Ludgeri*, *Pertz*, vol. ii. p. 419.

Meanwhile, *Angraria*, or the parts about *Engern* and *Minden*, divided *Westphalia* from *Eastphalia*.

CHAPTER IV.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—PARTS, ETC.—EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.—WRITERS PRIOR TO THE ANGLE CONQUEST.—TACITUS.—THE ANGRIVARII, ETC.—THE ANGLI. •

§ 23. So much for the notices of ancient Germany subsequent to the Conquest of England. What was ancient Germany *anterior* to that event? What, in the time of the classical writers, was that particular district which the Franks of the Carlovingian age called Saxony? What was it in the eyes of Tacitus and Ptolemy? Let us put these two extremes together; and, perhaps, we may throw a light over the intermediate period.

§ 24. *The Angrivarii*.—The author with whom we begin is Tacitus; who gives us the *Angrivarii*. They are the *Angrarii* of the Carlovingian writers. They also are the occupants of the parts about *Engern* in modern geography. Lying in the heart of *Saxonia*, and being found in both the earliest and the latest geography, they take the first place in our inquiries. The *Frisii* go along with them.

Translation.

The *Angrivarii* and *Chamavi* are backed immediately by the *Dulgibini* and *Chasuarii*, and by other nations not equally capable of being named. The *Frisians* succeed them in front. The *Great and Little Frisians* are named from their relative strengths. Each touches the Ocean, and lies along the Rhine. They also encircle immense lakes—lakes which the Roman fleets have yet to explore.

In the original.

Angrivarios et *Chamavos* a tergo *Dulgibini* et *Chasuarii* cludunt, aliæque gentes haud perinde memoratæ. A fronte *Fristii* excipiunt. *Majoribus minoribusque Fristiis* vocabulum est, ex modo virium: utræque nationes usque ad Oceanum Rheno prætexuntur, ambiuntque immensos insuper lacus, et Romanis classibus nondum navigatos.

§ 25. *The Chauci*.—Contiguous to the *Frisians* and, like the *Frisians*, extended along the coast, though dipping further inland, came the *Chauci*.

Translation.

The nation of the *Chauci*, although it begin where the Frisians end, and covers an immense tract of the sea-board, overlies the frontiers of all the nations I have enumerated, even until it winds itself into the land of the Chatti. So vast a space do the Chauci, not only hold, but fill—a people, amongst those of Germany, of the noblest.

In the original.

Chaucorum gens, quamquam incipiat a Frisiis, ac partem litoris occupet, omnium, quas exposui, gentium lateribus obtenditur, donec in Chattos usque sinuetur. Tam immensum terrarum spatium non tenent tantum Chauci, sed et implent: populus inter Germanos nobilissimus.

§ 26. *The Cherusci and Fosi.*—Again—*Translation.*

On the side of the Chauci and Chatti, the *Cherusci* have, for a long time, indulged in an excessive and weakening state of peace—unharassed—a peace more easy than safe. Amid the unrestrained and the strong you may maintain a false repose. Where action goes on, moderation and probity are the prerogative of the stronger. Hence, those who were once the good and just *Cherusci* are now the idle and foolish. With the victorious Chatti their good fortune has taken the name of wisdom. The *Fosi* were drawn in with the downfall of the *Cherusci*—the *Fosi*, a nation of the frontier. The *Fosi* who, their inferiors during their prosperity, are on fair grounds, their fellows in adversity.

In the original.

In latere *Chaucorum* *Chattorumque*, *Cherusci* nimiam ac marcentem diu pacem illa cessiti nutrierunt: idque jucundius, quam tutius fuit; quia inter impotentes et validos falso quiescas: ubi manu agitur, modestia ac probitas nomina superioris sunt. Ita qui olim 'boni æquique *Cherusci*,' nunc 'inertes ac stulti' vocantur: *Chattis* victoribus fortuna in sapientiam cessit. Tracti ruinâ *Cheruscorum* et *Fosi*, contermina gens, adversarum rerum ex æquo socii, cum in secundis minores fuissent.

§ 27. *The Angles, &c.*—For the actual Angles, and for the tribes more especially connected with them, we must look towards the Lower Elbe.

After noticing the Langobards, Tacitus continues:—

Translation.

The Reudigni next; then the Aviones, the *Angli*, the Varini, the Suardones, and the Nuithones, fortified by forests or rivers, &c.

In the original.

Reudigni deinde, et *Angli*, et Aviones, et Varini, et Suardones, et Nuithones fluminibus aut sylvis muniuntur, &c.

CHAPTER V.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—SPECIAL
NOTICE OF THE SAXONS BY PTOLEMY.

§ 28. *Ptolemy's* notice of the *Angles* is as follows:—

Translation.

Of the nations of the interior the greatest are those of the Suevi Angli, (who lie east of the Langobardi, stretching northwards to the middle course of the River Elbe,) and of the Suevi Semnones, who reach from the aforesaid part of the Elbe, eastward, to the river Suebus, and that of the Buguntæ, in continuation as far as the Vistula.

In the original.

Τῶν δὲ ἐντὸς καὶ μεσογείων ἐθνῶν μέγιστα μὲν ἐστὶ τό, τε τῶν Σουήβων τῶν Ἀγγεῖλων, οἳ εἰσιν ἀνατολικώτεροι τῶν Λαγγοβάρδων ἀνατείνοντες πρὸς τὰς ἄρκτους μέχρι τῶν μέσων τοῦ Ἀλβιος ποταμοῦ καὶ τὸ τῶν Σουήβων τῶν Σεμνόνων, οἵτινες διήκουσι μετὰ τὸν Ἀλβιν ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰρημένου μέρους πρὸς ἀνατολὰς μέχρι τοῦ Σουήβου ποταμοῦ καὶ τὸ τῶν Βουγούντων τὰ ἐφεξῆς καὶ μέχρι τοῦ Οὐιστούλα κατεχόντων.

§ 29. The *Saxons* of Ptolemy lay to the north of the Elbe, on the neck of the Chersonese, and the *Sigulones* occupied the Chersonese, itself, *westwards*.

Then come—

Translation.

(2) *The Sabalingii*; then (3) *the Kolandi*; above these (4) *the Chali*; and above them, but most to the west (5) *the Ffundusii*; more to the east (6) *the Charudes*; and most to the north of all (7) *the Cimbri*; (8) *the Pharodini* lay next to the Saxons between the rivers Chalusus and Suebus.

In the original.

Τὴν δὲ παρωκεανίτην κατέχουσιν ὑπὲρ μὲν τοὺς Βουσακτέρους οἱ Φρίσσιοι μέχρι τοῦ Ἀμασίου ποταμοῦ· μετὰ δὲ τούτους Καῦχοι οἱ μικροὶ μέχρι τοῦ Οὐισούργιος ποταμοῦ· εἴτα Καῦχοι οἱ μείζους μέχρι τοῦ Ἀλβιος ποταμοῦ· ἐφεξῆς δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐχένα τῆς Κιμβρικῆς Χερσονήσου Σάξονες· αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Χερσόνησον ὑπὲρ μὲν τοὺς Σάξονας Σιγούλωνες ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, εἴτα Σαβαλίγγιοι, εἴτα Κοβανδοί.

Ἐπὲρ οὖς Χάλοι, καὶ ἔτι ὑπὲρ τούτους δυσμικώτεροι μὲν Φουνδοῦσοι, ἀνατολικώτεροι δὲ Χαροῦδες, πάντων δὲ ἀρκτικώτεροι Κίμβροι.

Μετὰ δὲ τοὺς Σάξονας ἀπὸ τοῦ Χαλούσου ποταμοῦ μέχρι τοῦ Σουίβου ποταμοῦ Φαροδεινοί.

• In another place the three islands of the Saxons are mentioned.—Σαξόνων νῆσοι τρεῖς.

§ 30. Without attempting any closer details than our materials will allow, let us identify the continental part of the Saxon area of Ptolemy with the districts now named Stormar and Ditmarsh. As to the Saxons of the Islands, they are difficult to fix. Sylt, Fohr, and Nordstrand, are the localities most generally quoted. Perhaps, however, the relations of the land and water have altered since the time of Ptolemy.

It is only necessary to remember that there were Saxons on two localities; Saxons on the islands, and Saxons on the sea-coast; and that Ptolemy is the earliest author who uses the word.

CHAPTER VI.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—CONSIDERATION OF THE CHANGES WHICH MAY HAVE TAKEN PLACE BETWEEN THE CLASSICAL AND THE CARLOVINGIAN PERIODS.

§ 32. THE mother-country of the Angle invaders of England, in the time of the Carlovingsians, and in the eyes of the Franks, was Saxonia, or, in simple English, Saxony. Friesland was, occasionally, included in it.

Of these two areas, Saxony fell into divisions and subdivisions:—

I. *Cisalbian*; to the south of the Elbe, containing—
(1) Westphalia; (2) Angraria; (3) Eastphalia.

II. *Transalbian* or *Nordalbingian*; beyond the Elbe,

containing—(1) Ditmarsh; (2) Stormar; (3) Holstein Proper.

On the other hand, in the time of the classical writers, Frisia was the country of the Frisii Majores, Frisii Minores, and Chauci.

Saxonia, that of—

The Angrivarii in Angraria.

— Chamavi, Dulgubini, and Chasuarii in Westphalia.

— Cherusti in South,

— Fosi in Middle, } Eastphalia.

— Angli in North

Add, the Saxones, Sigulones, Harudes, &c., in Nordalbingia.

§ 33. Looking to the texts of the classical writers only, we cannot but observe that, although there is a certain amount of agreement between those of Tacitus and Ptolemy, there is a considerable deal of difference also. Still greater is that between the classics and Carlovingians. The Saxony of Ptolemy consists of a small tract of land in the so-called Cimbric Chersonese; whereas the Saxony of Charlemagne is a vast region. Again—several of the individual tribes of Tacitus are no longer apparent. There are no Fosi; no Cherusci.

These discrepancies must be investigated; since it is very important for us to know whether the Saxonia of the tenth century did or did not contain the descendants of the occupants of the same area in the second, third, or fourth. If it did, the history of the English Language is simplified. Fix the Angli of Tacitus to a certain part of Germany and find how that part is occupied under the Carlovingians and you determine the original country of our ancestors. The name has changed, but the population is the same. Assume, on the other hand, a migration, a conquest, or an extermination, and the whole question is altered.

§ 34. Now it is certain that there has been a change of some kind. Has it been *real* or *nominal*? Were the Cherusci (for instance) bodily changed, either by being exterminated on their soil, or by being transported elsewhere? or did they only lose the name *Cherusci*, taking that of *Saxons* instead? Cæsar, Strabo, Velleius Paterculus, all speak of the Cherusci, and all say nothing about the Saxons. On the other hand Claudian is the last writer in whom we find the word *Cherusci*. As long as the Cherusci are prominent the Saxons are obscure. As soon as we meet with the Saxons, the Cherusci disappear.

If we wish to cut the Gordian knot, we can have recourse to the assumption of migrations and displacements; in which case the newer names cease to represent the tribes that bore the older; giving us fresh populations instead. If so, the change is a *real* one. But what if the name alone have changed, the population remaining the same? In that case, the change is *nominal*.

§ 35. Nominal changes are of three kinds.

a. A population that at a certain period designated itself by a certain term, may let that term fall into disuse and substitute another in its place.

b. A population may have more than one designation, *e. g.* it may take one name when it is considered in respect to its geographical position, another in respect to its political relations, and a third in respect to its habits, &c. Of such names one may preponderate at one time, and another at another.

c. Thirdly, its own name may remain unchanged, but the name under which it is spoken of by another population may alter.

Now, real changes are rarer than nominal; and that not in Germany only but all the world over. Hence, when we ask whether, within a certain period, certain

alterations took place, we are not, without special reasons, to assume their *reality*. The mere change of name by no means justifies us in doing this.

§ 36. With this preliminary, the first thing that strikes us is that *Saxony* was a name which, in the mouth of a Frank, had a much wider signification than elsewhere. Ptolemy applies it to a mere fragment of land. Tacitus never uses it. With a Frank it meant any occupant of the parts immediately beyond the Frank frontier who was different from his own countrymen, without being a Roman, a Dane or a Slave. Sometimes it included, sometimes it excluded, the Frisians. Again, the Frank names are, chiefly, geographical, *e. g.* *Westfali*, *Ostphali*, *Nordalbingii*, whereas the names in Tacitus are the names of nations. No wonder they differ. With the difference, however, there is agreement. The *Angrivarii*, or *Angrarii*, are common to three periods—the Classical, the Carolingian, and the Modern: for (as has been already stated) *Engern* is the present form of the name.

§ 37. As a general rule, the Angli of the Carolingian period, so far as they are German, are merged in the Saxons. They occur, *eo nomine*, occasionally; but only occasionally. The *Angli* of the Carolingian period are generally the *English* of *England*—not of Germany.

CHAPTER VII.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—LANGUAGE.—THE OLD-SAXON.

§ 38. THE facts that now come under notice are those that supply our *internal* evidence.

In what parts of Germany were the languages nearest

akin to our own spoken? The mother-tongue of the present English is called *Anglo-Saxon*, and no written specimen of this Anglo-Saxon can be shown to have originated otherwise than as the language of England and on English ground. The manuscripts by which they have been transmitted to us were written in English monasteries; and the dialects which they embody are the dialects of certain English counties. We cannot often give the exact locality, nor yet determine the particular form of speech represented, but we can always say that England was the country in which the language was spoken and the letters written.

Yet the English language originated in Germany; and in Germany the so-called Anglo-Saxon must have been spoken during the whole period that the English invasion was going on, as well as for some time both before it began and after it had left off. It was certainly spoken, and may have been written. It may have been written, or (if not written) embodied in poetry, and so handed down orally. Have any such specimens reached us? This has been answered in the negative. The negative, however, applies only to the *form* of the compositions. I do not say that the *matter* of some of them may not be continental. For instance, there is the famous poem called *Beowulf*, in which no mention is made of England at all, and of which the heroes are Danes, Frisians, Geats, and Angles—Angles as they were in the original Angle-land of Germany, not Angles after the fashion of Ecbert, Alfred, and the English kings. Nevertheless, it is only the *matter* of *Beowulf* that is continental. Its *language* is that of the Anglo-Saxons of England, and England was the country in which it took its Anglo-Saxon form.

§ 39. Nevertheless, although there is nothing which is, at once, Angle in form and continental in locality,

there is something like it. There are several things like it; though in different degrees. Some are either known, or legitimately believed, to have originated within the limits of *Saxonia*—the *Saxonia* of the Franks, the *Old Saxony* of Beda. Others, on the other hand, are held to be Saxon, simply because their language exhibits certain characteristics. The more clearly we distinguish between these two classes the better.

At the head of the first class stand what may be called the *Essen Roll*, or the *Essen Muniments* (quoted as *Rotulus Essensis*), and the *Essen Creed* (i. e. *Confessionis Formula Essensis*); the locality of which, as indicated by their titles, is the district about the Westphalian town of Essen.

Van Vehus; ahte ende ahtedeg mudde maltes, ende ahte brod, tuena sostra erito, uiar mudde gerston, uiar uother theores holtes; te thrim hogetidon, ahte tian mudde maltes, ende thriuu uother holtes, ende uiarhtig bikera, ende usero herino misso tua crukon.

Van Ekansketha; *similiter*.

Van Rengerenthorpa; *similiter*.

Van Hukretha; *similiter*, ana that holt te then hogetidon * * * *

(?)
Van Brokhusen; te then hogetidon nigen mudde maltes, ende tuenteg bikera, ende tua crukon.

Van Horlen; nigen ende uiftech mudde maltes, ende tue uother thiores holtes, tue mudde gerston, uiar brot, en suster erito, tuenteg bikera, endi tua crukon, nigen mudde maltes te then hogetidon.

Van Ninhus; *similiter*.

Van Borthbeke; *similiter*.

Van Drene; te usero herano misso, tian ember honegas; te Pincoston sinondon haluon ember honegas, endi ahtodoch bikera, endi uiar crukon.

In English (literal).

From Viehhof; eight and eighty mittuns* of malt, and eight bread (?) two soster of peas, four mittuns of barley, four other of dry wood; to the three feasts, ten mittuns of malt, and three other of wood, and forty pitchers, and to our Lord's mass two crocks.

From Eickenscheid; *similiter*.

From Ringeldorf; *similiter*.

* This word, which is also English, from the Latin *modius*, has been treated as Keltic. The names of the measures are not translated.

From Huckarde ; *similiter*, without the wood to the feasts * * * *
 * * * (?)

From Brockhausen ; to the feast nine mittuns of malt, and twenty pitchers, and two crocks.

• From Horl ; fifty-nine mittuns of malt, and two other of dry wood, two mittuns of barley, four bread, one soster of peas, twenty pitchers, and two crocks, nine mittuns of malt to the feasts.

From Nienhaus ; *similiter*.

From Borbeck ; *similiter*.

From Drene ; to our Lord's mass, ten embers of honey ; to Pentekost, seven and a half embers of honey, and eighty pitchers, and four crocks.

To these add *The Legend of St. Boniface*, or *Fragmentum de Festo Omnium Sanctorum* from an Essen MS.

Vui lesed tho Sanctus Bonifacius Pauos an Roma uuas, that he bedi thena Kiesur aduocatum, that he imo an Romo en hus gefi, that thia luidi uuilon Pantheon heton, wan thar uuorthon alla afgoda inna begangana. So he it imo tho iegiuian hadda, so wieda he it an uses Drohtines era, ende usero Fruen Seta Marium, endi allero Cristes martiro ; te thiu, also thar er inna begangan vuarth thiu menigi thero diuילו, that thar nu inna begangan uuertha thiu gehugd allero godes heligono. He gibod the that al that folk this dages also the kalend Nouember anstendit (?) te kerikon quami, endi, also that god lika thianust thar al gedon was, so wither gewarf manno gewilik fra endi blithi te hus. Endi thanana so warth gewonohed that man hodigo, ahter allero thero waroldi, beged thia gehugd allero Godes heligono, te thiu so vuat so vui an allemo themo gera uergomeloson, that wi et al hodigo gefullon ; endi that vui, thur thero heligono gething, bekuman te themo ewigon liua, helpandemo usemo Drohtine.*

• *In English (literal).*

We read that when St. Boniface, Pope, was in Rome, he bade the Cæsar Advocatus to give him a house in Rome, that the people whilom called Pantheon, when there were all the heathen gods therein gone. When he had given it to him so hallowed he it to our Lord's honour, and our Lady's, the Holy Mary, and all the Christ's martyrs, to the end that, even as the multitude of devils had gone therein, now should go in the thought on all God's saints. He bade that all the folk this day, the kalends of November, (?) to church should come, and also that when godly service there all done was, every man should depart glad and blythe home. And thence was the custom that all men, at the present time, over all the world, take thought of all God's saints, so that what we in all the year have forgotten, we should to-day fulfil, and that we, through their holy intercession, should reach the everlasting life, our Lord helping.

* For the texts of this and the preceding, see Dorow's *Denkmäler*, and Lacomblet, in *Archiv für Geschichte Niederrhins*.

Not far from Essen is *Frekkenhorst*, which gives us a *Frekkenhorst Roll*, or the *Frekkenhorst Muniments*; of which the dialect is the same as that of the Essen records.

§ 40. The evidence that the *Abrenuntiatio Diaboli* is Westphalian is less conclusive than that conveyed by the names *Frekkenhorst* and *Essen*. Nevertheless, whilst neither Frisian nor Angle, it is referable to the pagan and semi-pagan districts of Germany.

The Original.

Q. Forsachis tu diabolae?

R. Ec forsacho diabolae, end allum diobolgelde; end ec forsacho allum diobolgeldae, end allum dioboles uuercum, and uuordum, Thunar ende Woden, ende Saxnote ende allum them unholdum the hiro genotas sint.

Q. Gelobis tu in Got Alamehtigan Fadaer?

R. Ec gelobo in Got Alamehtigan Fadaer

Q. Gelobis tu in Crist Godes Suno?

R. Ec gelobo in Crist Godes Suno.

Q. Gelobis tu in Halogan Gast?

R. Ec gelobo in Halogan Gast.

In English.

Q. Renouncest thou the Devil?

R. I renounce the Devil, and all Devil-guilds, and I renounce all Devil-guilds, and all the Devil's works, and words; Thunar. and Woden, and Saxnot, and all the unholy (ones) who are their fellows.

Q. Believest thou in God the Almighty Father?

R. I believe in God, the Almighty Father.

Q. Believest thou in Christ, God's Son?

R. I believe in Christ, God's Son.

Q. Believest thou in the Holy Ghost?

R. I believe in the Holy Ghost.

In the matter of *date*, the presumption is in favour of the *Abrenuntiatio* being older than anything less pagan than itself.

§ 41. The *Heliand* is *believed*, and that on good grounds, to represent the language of the parts about Münster. It is the most important of its class. *Heliand* means *Healer*, or *Saviour*; the work so entitled being a Gospel History in the Old-Saxon language, and in metre. Now, although it was in some part of Westphalia that

the Heliand took its form, it was in an English library that the MS. of it was first discovered. Hence it passed for a form of the Anglo-Saxon. But this form was so peculiar as to require an hypothesis to account for it; and the doctrine that a certain amount of Danish influence was the cause so far took form, and gained credence, as to establish the term *Dano-Saxon*. In the eyes, then, of Hickes, Lye, and the older Anglo-Saxon scholars, the Heliand was a Dano-Saxon composition, and so it continued until the present century, when not only was its Danish character denied, but its Westphalian origin was indicated.

Specimen.

Heliand, pp. 12, 13. (*Schmeller's Edition*.)

LUC. II. 8—13.

Tho uuard managun eud,
 Obar thesa uuidon uuerold.
 Uuardos antfundun,
 Thea thar, ehuscalkos,
 Uta uuarun,
 Uueros an uuahtu,
 Uniggeo gomean,
 Fehas aftar felda.
 Gisahun finistri an tuue
 Telatan an lufte;
 Endi quam liot Godes,
 Uuanum thurh thui uulcan;
 Endi thea uuardos thar
 Bifeng an them felda.
 Sie uurdun an forhtun tho,
 Thea man an ira moda.
 Gisahun thar mahtigna
 Godes Engil cuman;
 The im tegegnes sprac.
 Het that im thea uuardos—
 “Uuiht ne antdredin
 Ledes fon them liohta.
 Ic scal eu quadhe liobora thing,
 Suido uuarlico
 Uuilleon seggean,
 Oudean craft mikil.
 Nu^{is} Krist geboran,

Then it was to many known,
 Over this wide world.
 The words they discovered,
 Those that there, as horse-grooms,
 Without were,
 Men at watch,
 Horses to tend,
 Cattle on the field.
 They saw the darkness in two
 Dissipated in the atmosphere,
 And came a light of God
 —through the welkin;
 And the words there
 Caught on the field.
 They were in fright then
 The men in their mood.
 They saw there mighty
 God's angel come;
 That to them face-to-face spake.
 It bade thus them these words
 “Dread not a whit
 Of mischief from the light.
 I shall to you speak glad things,
 Very true;
 Say commands;
 Show strength great.
 Now is Christ born,

An thesere selbun naht,
 Salig barn Godes,
 An thera Davides burg,
 Drohtin the godo.
 That is mendislo
 Manno cunneas,
 Allaro firiho fruma.
 Thar gi ina fidan mugun,
 An Bethlema burg,
 Barno rikiost.
 Hebbiath that te tecna,
 That ic eu gitellea mag,
 Uuarun uuordun,
 That he thar biuundan ligid,
 That kind an enera cribbium,
 Tho he si cuning obar al
 Erdun endi himiles,
 Endi obar eldeo barn,
 Uueroldes uualdand."
 Reht so he tho that uuord gespra-
 cenun

So uuard thar engilo te them
 Unrim cuman,
 Helag heriskepi,
 Fon hebanuuanga,
 Fagar folc Godes,
 Endi filu sprakun,
 Lofuuord manag,
 Liudeo herron ;
 Afhobun tho helagna sang,
 Tho sie eft te hebanuuanga
 Uundun thurh thiu uuolcan.
 Thea uuardus hordun,
 Huo thiu engilo craft
 Alomahtigna God,
 Suido uuerdlico,
 Uuordun louodun.
 " Diurida si nu," quadun sie,
 " Drohtine selbun,
 An them hoboston
 Himilo rikea ;
 Endi fridu an erdu,
 Firiho barnum,
 Goduuilligun gumun,
 Them the God antkennead,
 Thurh hluttran hugi."

In this self-same night;
 The blessed child of God,
 In the David's city,
 The Lord the good.
 That is exultation
 To the races of men,
 Of all men the advancement.
 There ye may find him
 In the city of Bethlehem,
 The noblest of children.
 Ye have as a token
 That I tell ye
 True words,
 That he there swathed lieth,
 The child in a crib,
 Though he be king over all
 Earth and Heaven,
 And over the sons of men,
 Of the world the Ruler."
 Right as he that word spake.

So was there of Angels to them,
 In a multitude, come
 A holy host,
 From the Heaven-plains,
 The fair folk of God,
 And much they spake
 Praise-words many,
 To the Lord of Hosts.
 They raised the holy song,
 As they back to the Heaven-plains
 Wound through the welkin.
 The words they heard,
 How the strength of the Angels
 The Almighty God,
 Very worthily,
 With words praised.
 " Love be there now," quoth they,
 " To the Lord himself
 On the highest
 Kingdom of Heaven,
 And peace on earth
 To the children of men,
 Goodwilled men
 Who know God,
 Through a pure mind."

§ 42. Next in length to the Heliand come what are called the *Carolinian Psalms*. They certainly represent a form of speech akin to the Old Saxon; but whether they are Old Saxon in the strictest sense of the word is doubtful. They are treated by Ypeij as samples of the Old Dutch of Holland.

Specimen.

FROM THE TEXT OF A. YPEIJ.

Taalkundig Magazijn. P. 1, No. 1.—p. 54.

PSALM LIV.

2. GEHORI Got gebet min, in ne furuuir[p] bida mina; thenke te mi in gehori mi.

3. Gidruuit bin an tilogon minro, in mistrot bin fan stimmon fundes, in fan arbeide sundiges.

4. Uuanda geneigedon an mi unreht, in an abulge unsuoti unaron mi.

5. Herta min gidruuit ist an mi, in forta duodis fiel ouir mi.

6. Forthta in biuonga quamon ouer mi, in bethecoda mi thuisternussi.

7. In ic quad "uuie sal geuan mi fetheron also duuon, in ic fliugon sal, in raston sal."

8. Ecco! firroda ic fiende, inde bleif an eudi.

9. Ic sal beidan sin thie behaldon mi deda fan luzzilheide geistis in fan geuuidere.

10. Bescurgi, herro, te deile tunga iro, uuanda ic gesag unriht in fluoc an burgei.

11. An dag in naht umbefangan sal sia ouir mura ira, unreht in arbeit an mitdon iro in unreht.

12. In ne te fuor fan straton iro prisma in losunga.

13. Uuanda of fuoft flukit mi ic tholodit geuuisso; in of thie thie hatoda mi, ouir mi mikila thing spreke, ic burge mi so mohti geburran fan imo.

14. Thu geuuisso man einmuodigo, leido min in cundo min.

15. Thu samon mit mi suota nami muos, an huse Godes giengon uuir mit geluni.

16. Cum dot ouir sia, in nithir stigin an hellon libbinda. Uuanda arbeide an selethe iro, an mitdon ini.

17. Ic eft te Gode riepo, in Herro behielt mi.

18. An awont in an morgan in an mitdondage tellon sal ic, in kunden in he gehoron sal.

19. Irlosin sal an frithe sela mina fan then thia ginacont mi uuanda under managon he uuas mit mi.

20. Gehorun sal got in ginetheron sal sia; thie ist er uueroldi.

21. Ne geuuisso ist ini uuihsil; in ne forchedon Got. Theneda hant sina an uuitherloni.

§ 43. *Hildebrand and Hathubrand*.—This is a short and apparently a fragmentary poem, in alliterative metre, concerning two heroes, father and son, of the times of Diedrich of Berne (Theodoric of Verona) and Otacher (Odoacer). It is held, by Grimm, to be Old Saxon, in the hands of a Frank copyist. It is, apparently, a transitional form of speech.

In the Original.

Ih gihorta dat seggen,
 Dat sie urhetton ænon muotin,
 Hiltebraht endi Haðubraht,
 Untar heriun tuem
 Sunufatarungo (?)
 Iro saro (?) rihtun,
 Garutun sie iro guthhamum,
 Gurtun sie iro suert ana,
 Helidos ubar ringa,
 Do sie to dero hiltiu ritun.
 Hiltebraht gimahalta,
 Heribrantes sunu ;
 Her was heroro man,
 Ferahes frotoro,
 Her fragen gistuont (?)
 Fohem wortum: wer sin "fater wari;
 "Fireo in folche ;
 "Eddo weliches cnuosles du sis."

In English.

I heard that say, [bat,
 That they challenged in single com-
 Hiltebraht and Hathubraht,
 Between the armies,
 * * * * * (?)
 * * * * * (?)
 They made ready their war-coats,
 They girt their swords on,
 Heroes over the ring,
 When they to the war rode.
 Hiltebraht answered,
 Heribrant's son,
 He was the nobler man,
 Of age more wise,
 He asked stood (?) [was,
 With few words; who his "father
 "In the folk of men,
 "Or of what kin thou beest."

§ 44. Can traces of the Saxon be found in the existing German dialects? They can. The plural of the Platt-Deutsch dialects ends in *-t*, in the second person only; the others ending in *-n*. In Saxon the first and third ended in *-t* also. So they do now in more than one dialect of the Saxon area.

First Person.

*Dialect of Butjahde.**

Hee schull by siens glyken blyven ;
 Wy kahmt also wyt as hee ;
 Iok kann lesen, reknen, schrieven ;
 Dat is nok woll gar vār dree.

In English.

He should remain with his equals ;
 We have come as far as he :
 I can read, reckon, write,
 That is enough for three.

* This and the three following extracts are from Firmenich's *Germaniens Völkerstimmen*, pp. 222, 228, 28, 246.

*Dialect of the Town of Oldenburg.**In English.*

Ben'n Ossen willt wi vör Di föhren,	An ox will we before thee bring,
Dat sülvst Du stüst wo grost se sind ;	That self you may see how big they are ;
Dock kann sik saken et geboren,	Still it may*, perhaps, happen
Dat man se noch väl gröter findt.	That one may find them still bigger.

*Third Person.**Dialect of Jever.**In English.*

Dat iste Banter Karkhof,	That is the churchyard of Bant,
De liggt buten dieks up d'Groo ;	That lies out up in the deep ;
De Tuten de roopt, un d'Seekobb kritt,	The sand-pipers cry, and the sea-mews shriek,
De Dooden de hürt to.	They belong to the dead.

Dialect of Osnaburgh.

Dar ginten, dar kiket de Strauten henup,
 Dar stahet wat aulè Wywer in 'n Trupp ;
 De Annke, de Hildke, de Geske, de Siltke,
 De Trintke, de Äultke, de Elsbeen, de Täultke ;
 Wann de sick entmöllet, dat schnaatert sau sehr
 Liefhaftig as wenn't in 'n Gausestall wör.

In English.

There yonder, there look up the street,
 There stand the old women in a troop ;
 The Annke, the Hildke, the Geske, the Siltke,
 The Trintke, the Aultke, the Elsbeen, the* Taultke.
 When they meet each other, it cackles so sore,†
 Just as if it were in a goose-stall.

This, however, is *Old* Saxon. The A. S. ending was *p (th)*. Still, the Saxon plural remains.

* Annie, Hilda, Jessie, Sibyll, Catherine, — (?) Elizabeth, Adelaide.

† As in full sore = much.

CHAPTER VIII.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—LANGUAGE.—THE FRISIAN—OLD, MIDDLE, AND NEW.

§ 45. *The Old Frisian*.—Closely akin to the mother-tongue of the present English was the Frisian; of which, in its oldest form, the following is a specimen.

Asega-bog, i. 3. pp. 13, 14. (*Ed. Wiarda*.)

That is thiū thredde liodkest and thes Kynig Kerles ieft, theter allera monna ek ana sina eyna gode besitte umberavat. Hit ne se thet ma hine urwinne mith tele and mith retbe and mith riuchta thingate. Sa hebbere alsam sin Asega dema and dele to lioda londriuchte. Ther ne hach nen Asega nenne dom to delande hit ne se thet hi to fara tha Keysere fon Rume esweren hebbe and thet hi fon da liodon ekeren se. Sa hoch hi thenne to demande and to delande tha fiande alsare friounde, thruch des ethes willa, ther hi to fara tha Keysere fon Rume esweren heth, tho demande and to delande widuon and weson, waluberon and alle werlosa liodon, like to helpande and sine threa knilinge. Alsa thi Asega nimth tha unriuchta mida and tha urlouada panninga, and ma hini urtinga mi mith twam sine juenethon an thes Kyninges bonne, sa ne hoch hi nenne dom mar to delande, truch thet thi Asega thi biteknath theene prestere, hwande hia send siande and hia skilun wesa agon there heliga Kerstenede, hia skilun helpa alle tham ther hiam seluon nauwet helpa ne muge.

The same, in English. •

That is the third determination and concession of King Charles, that of all men each one possess his own goods (house?) unrobbed. It may not be that any man overcome him with charges (tales), and with summons (rede), and with legal action. So let him hold as his Asega (judge) dooms and deals according to the land-right of the people. There shall no Asega deal a doom unless it be that before the Cæsar of Rome he shall have sworn, and that he shall have been by the people chosen. He has then to doom and deal to foes as to friends, through the force (will) of the oath which he before the Cæsar of Rome has sworn, to doom and to deal to widows and orphans, to wayfarers and all defenceless people, to help them as his own kind in the third degree. If the Asega take an illegal reward, or pledged money, and a man convict him before two of his colleagues in the King's Court, he has no more to doom, since it is the Asega that betokens the priest, and they are seeing, and they should be the

eyes of the holy Christendom, they should help all those who may nought help themselves.

§ 46. *The Middle Frisian*.—Without determining too nicely at what exact time the Old Frisian stage ceases, we may take the middle of the seventeenth century (*say* A.D. 1650) as the date for the fullest development of the Middle; the chief classic of the Middle Frisian literature being Gysbert (Gilbert) Japicx.

1.*

Swiet, ja swiet is 't, oere miete
't boaskien foar e jonge lie;
Kreftich swiet is 't, sizz' ik jiette,
As it giet mei âlders rie.
Mar oars tiget 'et to'n pleach,
As ik oan myn geafeynt seach.

1.*

Sweet, yes sweet is over measure
The marrying for the young people.
Most sweet is it, I say yet,
When it goes with the elders' rede.
But otherwise it tends to a plague,
As I on my village saw.

2.

"Goune Swobke, lit uws pearje,"
Bea hy har mei mylde stemm.
"Ofke," sei se, "ho scoe 'k it
klearje!
Wist du! rie to heite in mem?"
"Ljeaf dat nim ik to myn laest."
Dear mei wieg de knôte faest.

2.

"Golden Swobke, let us pair,"
He bade her with a mild voice.
"Ofke," she said, "How should I
clear it!
Wistthou! rede, father and mother?"
"Love! I take this to my last."
Therewith was the knot fast.

3.

Da dit pear togear scoe ite,
In hja hiene nin gewin,
Heite seach, as woe hfy bite,
Mem wier stjoersch in lef fen
sin.
"Ofke," sei se, "elk jier in
bern.
Wier ik fâem! ik woe 't so jern."

3.

When this pair together should eat,
And they had no gain,
Father saw as if he would bite,
Mother was stern and cross of hu-
mour.
"Ofke," she said, "each year a
child.
Were I maid! I would I were."

4.

Hoite in Hoatske Sneins to kea-
mer
Mekken it mei elkoarme klear.
Tetke krigge Sjolle kreamer,
To Sint Eal by wyn in hjeär.
Nu rint elk om as in slet,
In bekleye 't; mar to let.

4.

Hoite and Hoatske every Sunday
in the inn
Made it clear with each other.
Tetke got Sjolle the pedlar
To St. Alofs by wine and beer.
Now each runs about as a slut,
And complains; but too late.

* From the Preface to Dr. Bosworth's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.

5.

Oeds die better, nei ik achtje,
 Da hy Saets syn trou tosei :
 Hy liet de alders even plachtje,
 Hwet se oan elk ich joene mei.
 Nu besit hy huws in schuw'r,
 In syn bern fleane all' man uwr.

6.

Ork, myn Soan, wolt du bedye,
 Rin naet oan allyk ien moll' !
 Jeld in rie lit mei dy frye,
 Bern, so gean' dyn saken wol.
 Den scil de himel uwr dyn
 dwæen
 Lok in mylde seining' jaen.

5.

Oeds did better as I heed,
 When he said to Saets his troth :
 He let the elders even plight,
 What they on each side gave.
 Now he possesses house and barn,
 And his children outdo all men.

6.

Ork, my Son, wouldst thou thrive,
 Run not on all like a mole;
 Let age and rede woo with thee,
 Child, then go thy affairs well;
 Then the heaven shall give over
 thy doings
 Luck and mild blessings.

§ 47. Of the Frisian, as it is spoken at the present time in West Friesland, the following is a specimen.

ABE IN FETSE.*

ABE.—Ho djoer binne de mieren, Fetse? Ik haw jister net nei sted wæst.

FETSE.—'k wit net; sa hwat by de daelder om, eak ien kromke er oer.

ABE.—Wierne er al rju?

FETSE.—Ja, dêr stiene al hele keppels. It liket dat se rom binne, mar it wier myn soarte net.

ABE.—Heste den dyn fæste mieren jiers? Hawwe se hjar eigen kost, jimme mieren?

FETSE.—Hwet mienste? dat ik my de earen fen 'e kop frette litte wol? Ik haw simmers genoach oan twa uwthongere Waldlju, dy 't 'k by my yn de ongetiid ha'.

ABE.—Jane jimme se den jouns eak neat?

FETSE.—Ja, den krye se sa hwat ein Leal kroädfol suwpenbry, in dat behimmelje se eak suwkerswiet. Ik wit net wêr se it berchje yn hjar smelle pansen. Hja binne wis cars fen birned as ien Fries.

ABE.—Ei, kom ju! It binne ommers eak minsken as wy.

The same in the Dutch of Holland.

ABE.—Hoe duur zyn de mieren Fetse? ik ben gisteren niet naar de stad geweest.

FETSE.—Ik weet het niet; ongeveer een daalder en ook een kruimkje er over.

ABE.—Waren er veel.

FETSE.—Ja, er waren al heele hoopen. Het schynt dat ze ruim zyn; maar het waren geen van myn soort.

ABE.—Hebt gy dan uwe vaste mieren jaarlyks? Hebben uwe mieren hunne eigen kost?

* From *De Scheerwinkel fen Joute-Baas*, pp. 1—3—(*Dimter*, i. t. *Deventer*, 1835).

FETSE.—Wat bedoelt gy? dat ik my de oeren van hét hoofd zal laten eten? ik heb in den zomer genoeg aan twee uitgehongerde Woudlieden welke ik by my heb in de hoojing.

ABE.—Geeft gy ze dan 'savonds ook niets.

FETSE.—Ja, dan krygen ze ongeveer een geheele kruiwagen vol karneemelk, en dat eten ze ook zuikerzoet op. Ik weet niet waar ze het bergen in hunne kleine darmen. Ze zyn zeker inwendig verschillend van een Fries.

ABE.—Och kom reis! het zyn immers ook menschen als wy.

In English.

ABE.—How dear are (*what is the price of*) the mowers, Fetse? I was not in the town yesterday.

FETSE.—I wot not; about a dollar a man and a bit (*crumb*) over.

ABE.—Were there plenty of them?

FETSE.—Yes, there stood whole heaps. It seemed as if there were enough of them; but it is not my sort.

ABE.—Hast thou then your mowers regular (*fast*) by the year? Do they keep themselves (*have they their own cost*) your mowers?

FETSE.—What meanest thou? That I should let my ears be eaten off my head? I had enough in summer, with two starved wood-countrymen, that I had with me at the hay-time.

ABE.—Did you not then give them anything in the afternoon?

FETSE.—Yes! Then they must have (*crave*) about a whole bucketfull of porridge (*soup and barley*); and that must be as sweet as sugar. I wot not where they bury it in their small paunches. They must ywiss (*certainly*) be of a different sort in their insides from a Fries.

ABE.—Come now! They are still men like ourselves (*as we*).

§ 48. The province, however, of Friesland is not the only district where Frisian is spoken at the present moment. It is spoken in East Friesland, in the fenny tract called Saterland.

*Saterland Dialect of the East Frisian.**

1.

Ihk kahn nit sette, kahn nit stoende,
Etter min allerljowste wall ikk gounge.
Dehr wall ihk var de Finnster stoende,
Bett dett de Oolder etter Bedde gounge.

2.

Well stand der var, well kloppet an,
De mi so sennig apwaakje kahn?
Det is din allerljowste, din
Schatz, stoend nu ap, und let mi der in.

* Firmenich, p. 233.

3.

Ihk stoende nit ap, lete di dir nit in,
 Bett dett min Oolder etter Bedde sünt,
 Gounge du nu fout in den grenen Wold,
 Denn mine Oolder schlepe bald.

4.

Wo lange schell ihk der buten stoende ?
 Ihk sjo dett Meddenroth ounkume,
 Dett Meddenroth, two helle Sterne,
 Bi di Allerljowste schlepe ikh jedden.

*The same in the Platt-deutsch of Vechta.**

1.

Ik kann nit sitten, kann nit stahn,
 Na miner Allerliefsten will ik gahn ;
 Dar will ik vär datt Fenster stahn,
 Bett datt de Oolen na Bedde gahn.

2.

Well steit dar vär, well kloppet an
 De mi so sinnig upwecken kann ?
 Datt is din Allerlefste, din
 Schatz, stah nu up, un laat mi der in.

3.

Ik stah nich up, sate di der nich in,
 Bett datt mine Oolen na'n bedde sünt,
 Ah du nu hen in den grönen Wald,
 Denn mine Oolen schlapet bolle ?

4.

Wo lange schall ick dar butan stahn ?
 Ick see datt Morgenroth ankamen.
 Datt Morgenroth, twe helle Stern,
 Bi di, Allerlefste, schlöpe ick geren.

In English.

1.

I can not sit, can not stand,
 After my all-dearest will I gang,
 There will I before the window stand,
 Till that the elders after bed gang.

2.

Who stands there before ? who knocks on ?
 Who me so late upwaken can ?
 That is thy all-dearest, thy
 Treasure, stand now up and let me there in.

* Firmenich, p. 235.

3.

I stand not up, let thee not in,
Till that my elders after bed are,
Gang thou now forth in the green wood,
Then my elders sleep soon.

4.

How long shall I there without stand ?
I see the morning-red on-come,
The morning-red, two bright stars,
With thee, all-dearest, sleep I willingly.

It is spoken in Wangeroog.

§ 49. It is spoken in Heligoland.

*The Contented Heligolander.**

1.

Letj' Famel, kumm ens juart tu mi !
Di best di bast üph Lunn,
Ick ben verleeft, hohl väll üph Di,
Ick bed, du mi dien Hunn.

2.

Skuld Di met mi tofreden wees
Es ick met Di ook ben,
Wiar ook ühs Klohr van Boy en Frees,
Wann wi tofreden sen.

3.

Dann ess ühs Hemmelrick nigg fier,
Ühs Glück haa wi uhn't Hart.
Haa wi keen Wien dann drink wi Bier
Wi wet van keenen Smart.

4.

Wann wi met acker koyern gung
Wi gung ühs aya Way,
Di Tidt wardt üs dann gar nigg lung,
So flöggt üs ball di Day.

In English.

1.

Little woman, come * * * (?) to me !
Thou beest the best up land,
I am in love, hold well up thee (*think much of thee*),
I pray, do (*give*) me thine hand.

2.

Should'st thou with me contented be
 As I with thee eke be,
 Be eke (*even*) our clothes of woollen and frieze,
 When we contented be.

3.

Than is our Heaven not far,
 Our happiness (*luck*) had we in heart,
 Have we no wine, then drink we beer,
 We wit (*know*) of no smart.

4.

When we with one-another loving gang,
 We gang our own way,
 The time (*tide*) is (to) us then at all not long,
 So flies us soon the day.

§ 50. It is spoken in the (comparatively) large islands Föhr, Amröm, and Sylt; the Sylt sub-dialect being made almost classical by the poems of J. P. Hansen.

Dialect of Sylt.

THE OLD DACHELOR.*

1.

Knap wejr ick üt min Jungens Skuur,
 Knap Diütisent weken ual,
 Da kam dat Frün al ün min Sen ;
 En Brid fuar mi wejr Nummer Jen ;
 Ark In da lüp ik hür en dejn,
 Hur en Jungfaarnen wejr.

2.

Val feng ick uk dat Je ian Jen ;
 Man min Moodter wildt ek lüd,
 Jü secd "Min Seen, fortune jest wat ;
 Din arwdeel maaket di kwal ek fat,
 Wü sen jit di jest fjuurtein Jaar
 Ek tünet me en Snaar."

3.

Sok Wurder hed ik ek hol' jerd ;
 Man wat wejr jir tö dön ?
 Ütfan tö See will 'k mi da üw,
 En fjuurtein Jaar fan Hüs afflûw,
 Tö beek is toamol nü di Tid,
 En ik ha jit nün Brid.

* Firmenich, p. 5.

In English.

1.

Scarce was I out of my youth's shoes,
 Scarce a dozen weeks old,
 Then came courting in my mind,
 A bride for me was Number One;
 Each evening ran I here and there,
 Wherever a young woman was.

2.

Well got I eke a Yes from one,
 But my mother would not bear it;
 She said, "My son, earn something,
 We are yet just fourteen years,
 Not served by a daughter-in-law."

3.

Such words had I not willingly heard,
 But what was here to do?
 Go out to sea will I,
 And fourteen years from house stay away.
 Back, is twice now the time,
 And I have yet no bride.

§ 51. Finally, it is spoken along the west coast of the Duchy of Sleswick, and in the *small* islands. The men and women who speak it call themselves *Friese*, and draw a clear distinction between themselves on one side, and the Danes and the Germans on the other. They amount to about 30,000.

*North Frisian of the Mainland.**

Dat hew ick de denn nō aw Fraisk verthelt, for dat dō hahl ihsen Stedsonninger Fraisk hiere wāist. De tulle Dankwert schall sehde, dat bei Oxlef dat beest Fräisk snaket word. Dat mei vilicht to sin Tid richtig ween wese, as dat Fräisklōm nog so grott wos dat Oxlef sowatt ma öin tai. Dat es nō örs, den dat Tjōsk namont her altn's Owerhöind, en so kan dat Fräisk ai rin bliwe. Ick tonk me, dat dat beest Fräisk nō to Tids bei'e Böttendik, bei Daagebüll, oder vilicht a'we Hallige snaket ward. Von Fairinger en'e Seltinger wall ick gaar ai suake, de kon hum je gaar ai verstōnne wenn hum me jem snake wall.

In English.

This is what I have told you about the Frisian, at that time when all the Stedessonig people here were Frisian. The old Dankwert shall have said the best Frisian was spoken at Oxlef. That may, perhaps, have been

* From Allen's *Danske Sprogs Historie i Hertugdømmet Slesvig*, vol. ii., p. 751.

the case in his time, when Friesland was so great that Oxlef lay within it. This is now otherwise; for the German has got the upperhand, and so the Frisian cannot remain pure. I think that the best Frisian, now-a-days, is spoken at Bottendik, or at Daagebull, or, perhaps, on some of the small islands (Hallige) of the people of Föhr and Sylt. I will not speak, I cannot understand them, when they will talk with me.

PSALM CXXXIX.*

1. Hiere, dö forshest me ütt, an kännst me.
2. Ick sátt untig stäujn áp, sö wiest dö 't; dö forstönst min tögte fön fierense.
3. Ick gong untig ládd, sö büst dö ám me, an sjögst äll mín wége.
4. Dánn sieh, dirr ás nijn urd áw mán tung, wát dö, Hiere, ài alles wiest.
5. Dö shäfest't, wát ick faar untig herréften duhg, an halst din häujnn auwer me.
6. Düt tó forstäunnen as me ältó wunnerbaur, an ältó huch; ick kön't ai begrippe.
7. Wirr sháll ick hânegonge faar dán Geist? an wirr sháll ick hânefijn faar dín önláss?
8. Faur ick ápaujn'e Hám met, sö bást dö dirr; mäget ik mín Bédđ áujn'e 'e Hälle, lauck, sö bást do oik dirr.

The Wooer from Holstein.

Diar Kam en skep bi Sudher Sjõe	There came a ship by the South Sea,
Me, tri jung fruers ön di flöt.	With three young wooers on the flood;
Hokken wiar di fürdeorst?	Who was the first?
Dit wiar Peter Rothgrun.	That was Peter Rothgrun.
Hud säät hi sin spooren?	Where set he his tracks?
Fuar Hennerk Jerken's düür.	For Hennerk Jerken's door.
Hokken kam tö düür?	Who came to door?
Marrike sallef.	Mary-kin herself,
Me krük en bekker ön di jen hundh,	Crock and beaker in one hand,
En gulde ring aur di udher hundh.	A gold ring on the other hand.
Jü nöðhight höm en sin hinghist in,	She pressed him and his horse in,
Düð di hingst haaver und Peter wün.	Gave the horse oats and Peter wine.
Toonkh Gott fuar des gud dei.	Thank God for this good day!
Al di brid end bridmaaner of wei,	All brides and bridesmen out of way!
Butolter Marri en Peter allüning!	Except Mary and Peter alone.
Jü look höm ün to kest	She locked him up in her box,
En wildh höm nimmer muar mest.	And never would miss him more.

For the nearest congener of the English, the Frisian, as exhibited in the foregoing specimens, is anything but easy reading to an Englishman. It may, also, be added,

* From Bendsen's *Die Nordfriesische Sprache*, p. 450.

that the Saterland sample is all but the ordinary Platt Deutsch. It is certainly Germanized. On the other hand, the relation of the modern forms of speech to the Old Frisian (which is that of the provincial dialects of England to the Anglo-Saxon) is clear: and clear and close is that between the Old Frisian itself and the Anglo-Saxon.

§ 52. It is easy to see that the Frisian, as it now stands, gives us but the fragments of a language. The dialects of the islands are, of course, isolated: inasmuch as the sea separates them. The isolation of the districts of the main land is in a different predicament. It suggests the notion of an original continuity. If such were actually the case, the northern boundaries of the Frisian must be sought on the Hvidaa, the Southern on the Rhine. The more we go into detail, the more we find this to have been the case. East Friesland was what its name suggests; whilst a part, at least, of Oldenburgh was East Frisian also. The parts, however, between the Weser and the Elbe show few signs of Frisian occupancy. No wonder. They lie between the two old and important towns of Bremen and Hamburg, which, from the tenth century downwards, have been centres from which the German has diffused itself. On the north of the Elbe comes Ditmarsh; of which only thus much can be said, viz., that if the language were ever Frisian, it had become obsolete before A.D. 1452. Eydersted, on the other hand, though now German, was not only originally Frisian, but can be shown to have been so. Jacob Sax, A.D. 1610, writes that "the inhabitants, besides the Saxon, use their own extraordinary natural speech, which is the same as the East and West Frisian." Again, in 1752 and 1765 we have notices of its existence. Whether traces of it can now be found is uncertain. Schröder speaks of them as existing in 1837. Of the

islands, Nordstrand and Pelvorm are the least Frisian—if they be so at all. . In the former a great inundation, A.D. 1610, was followed by the introduction of a colony of Germans. As late, however, as 1639, at least, Frisian was spoken in Nordstrand. In 1452, the following inscription was found on a font at Büsum, which the natives of Ditmarsh, who carried it off, were unable to translate. It ran thus:—

Original.

Disse hirren döpe de have wi thön ewigen ohnthonken mage lete,
da schollen osse berrne in kressent warde.

Translated by Clemens, into the present Frisian of Amröm.

Thas hirr döp di ha wi tun iwagen unthonken mage leat, thiar skell
tis biarner un krassent wurd.

In English.

This here dip (*font*) have we as an everlasting remembrance let be
made, there shall our bairns be christened in it.

North of Pelvorm, the Frisian is the rule rather than the exception. There is less of it in Amrom than in Föhr. Of Föhr there is less on the western than the eastern half. Sylt is Frisian except at its north extremity. In Sylt, however, the Frisian ceases.

§ 53. The Frisian has been encroached on by two languages—the German and the Danish: in Pelvorm, Nordstrand, Eydersted, and the parts about Husum by the former, in the parts about Leck, Stådum, and Töndern by the latter. The exact details of its original extension are obscure. To the *north* of its present boundary it was spoken in Rodenæs, Nykerk, and Aventoft; to the *west* of it in Leck, Enge, Hjoldelund, Fjolde, Ollerup, and Swesing. Roughly speaking, we may say that it stretched over about a third of the southern half of Sleswick.

§ 54. I believe that the North Frisians are the descendants and representatives of some of the Nordalbingian Saxons; who (if such were the case) were slightly different

from both the *Old Saxons* of Westphalia and the *Angles*—only, however, slightly. I believe this because I find, on North-Frisian ground, no trace of any older German population. Why, then, were these North Frisians called *Saxons*? Has it not been said that, at the present moment, they call themselves *Friese*? And may it not be added, that both the Danes and the Germans of their frontier call them *Friese* also? It may. The sources, however, from which we get the term *Nordalbingian Saxon* are neither Frisian nor Danish. They are *Frank*; and although the Franks generally (though not always) distinguished Frisia Proper (*i. e.* East and West Friesland) from Saxony, they may easily have treated such an outlying tract as North Friesland as part of it. This I believe them to have done.

CHAPTER IX.

GERMAN ORIGIN, ETC.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—LANGUAGE.—LOCAL NAMES.—PERSONAL NAMES.

§ 55. As a general rule, the names on a map of England are British or English. A few, like *Etruria*, are new. A few, like *East-ville*, *Tower-le-Moors*, are, more or less, French. A few, like *Weston-super-mare* are, more or less, Latin. Not a few are Danish. As a general rule, however, the names that we find at the present moment are names that, with a slight modification of form, may have belonged to either the British or the Anglo-Saxon period,—more especially to the latter.

Many, very many, of these are compounds; compounds wherein the element of the wider and more general signification comes *last*; *e. g.* *Stántún*, or *Sandwíc*, is the *town* characterized by *stones*, or the *wic* characterized by *sand*.

§ 56. The following elements in the names of places deserve notice:—

Bæc, A. S. = *beck* = *brook*. The High German *bach*. It has (somewhat hastily) been considered a Danish, rather than an Angle, element.

Botl, A. S. = *bottle*—as in *Har-bottle* = *dwelling-place, building*. Common in the western half of the Duchy of Holstein.

Bróc, A. S. = *brook*—*Spell-brook*, &c.

Díc, A. S. = *dike, ditch*—*Fos-dyke, Dyke*, &c.

Ig, A. S. = *island*; as in *Ccortes-ig* = *Cherts-ey*.

Feld, A. S. Form for form, this is the English *field*. In A. S., however, it meant an open tract of land rather than an enclosure.

Fen, A. S. = *fen*.

Fleet, A. S. = *fleet*, as in the *Fleet Ditch*, or the river *Fleet*.

Ford, A. S. = *ford*. Word for word, it is the same as the Danish *Fiord*. The Danish (Norse) *f-rd*, however, means an *arm of the sea*.

Ham, A. S. = *home*. The *-ham* in words like *Nottingham*, *Threeking-ham*, &c.

Hangra, A. S.; *-anger*, English, as in *Birch-anger*, *Pensh-anger* = a *meadow*.

Hlaw, A. S. = a *rising ground*. The *-law* so frequent in Scotland, as applied to hills, *e. g.* *Berwick-law*, &c.

Holt, A. S. = *holt* = *wood*; as in *North-holt*.

Hyrne, A. S. = *corner, angle*. Danish as well as Saxon, and, from being found in the more Danish parts of Britain, has passed for an *exclusively* Danish word—which it is not.

Hyrst, A. S. = *hurst* = *copse or wood*. One of the most characteristic words of the list, as may be seen from the comparison of any map of Northern Germany, with one of Kent or Bedfordshire.

Leah, A. S. = *lea*. The *-ley*, in *Baddow-ley*, *Mading-ley*, &c.

Mere, A. S. and English—*Whittlesea Mere*.

Mersc, A. S. = *marsh*—*Peas-marsh*.

Mór, A. S. = *moor*—*Dart-moor*.

Mos, A. S. = *moss* = *moor*, or *swamp*; as in *Chat-mos*, i. e. a locality where *mosses* grow abundantly rather than the *moss* itself.

Næs, A. S. = *ness* (or *naze*)—*Shoebury-ness*, *Walton-on-the-Naze*—Scandinavian as well as German. Indeed, it is more or less Slavonic and Latin as well—*noss* and *nas-us*.

Seta, A. S. = *settler*—*Somer-set*, *Dor-set*.

Stán, A. S. = *stone*—*Whet-stone*.

Steal, A. S. = *stall*—*Heppen-stall*.

Stede, A. S. = *place* = the *-stead* in words like *Hampstead*, &c.

Stow, A. S. = *place*—*stow*, *Wit-stow*.

Túft, A. S. = *toft*, as in *Wig-toft*.

Tún, A. S. = *ton*—*Nor-ton*, *Sut-ton* = *North-town*, *South-town*.

Weg, A. S. = *way*—*Strang-way*.

Wic, A. S. = *wick*, *wich*—*Aln-wick*, *Green-wick*, *Wick*.

Worðig, A. S. = *-worth* in *Tam-worth*, *Box-worth*.

Wudu, A. S. = *wood*—*Sel-wood*, *Wich-wood*.

Wyl, A. S. = *well*—*Ash-well*, *Am-well*.

þorp, A. S. = *thorp*—*Maple-thorp*.

§ 57. (a.) For the geographical names of one district to exhibit an accurate coincidence with those of another, the physical conditions of the countries should be identical. We cannot expect to find the terms that apply to fens and marshes in an alpine region; nor, *vice versâ*, the names for rocks and hills amongst the fens. Compare Holland with Derbyshire, and you will find but few names common to the two. Compare Lincolnshire with the Hartz, and the result will be equally negative. Com-

pare it, however, with Holland, and *fens* and *moors* occur abundantly.

(b.) For the geographical names of one district to exhibit an accurate coincidence with those of another, their *meanings* should be identical. Sometimes this is the case. The *becks* of England are brooks or streams; those of Germany the same. The *-tons*, *-túns*, or *-towns*, however, of Germany are of the rarest; indeed they are scarcely, if at all, to be found. Yet the word is German: its form being *zaun*. In Germany, however, it means a *hedge*, and in Holland (where it is *tuin*) a *garden*. The notion of *enclosure* lies at the bottom of its meaning. The details, however, which result from it are different.

(c.) For the geographical names of one district to exhibit an accurate coincidence with those of another, their *form* should be identical. The element *-ham* is found all over Germany. But it is not found in the same parts: it is *-heim* in some; in others *-hem*, in others *-um*—e. g. *Oppen-heim*, *Arn-hem*, *Hus-um*.

§ 58. *Personal Names*.—Unlike the local, the personal names of modern England are pre-eminently heterogeneous. The surnames are so. The Christian names are so. Some are French, some Hebrew, some Greek. Nevertheless, some are German. Finally, some are more especially Anglo-Saxon. A little was written on this point, when the difference between the older and newer names of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was indicated. The system that gives our *Alfreds*, *Edwins*, and *Edwards*, is not the system that gives us such names as *Port* and *Stuf*. A little more may now be added. Let any who doubts their value as an instrument of criticism, look for *Edwins* and *Edwards* amongst the Goths; for *Wilhelms* and *Hun-nerics* (*Henries*) amongst the Danes; for *Cnuts*, *Olafs*, and *Harolds* amongst the Franks. He will find but few.

CHAPTER X.

GERMAN ORIGIN, ETC.—APPLICATION OF PREVIOUS PRINCIPLES.—DISTRIBUTION OF LOCAL NAMES.—SIGNS OF DANISH, OF SLAVONIC, AND OF FRISIAN AND OLD SAXON OCCUPANCY.

§ 59. *Signs of Danish occupancy.*—The chief sign of Danish occupancy is the termination *-by*, meaning *town, village, or settlement*. * Where an Angle said *Charlton*, a Dane said *Carlby*. Now, south of the Eyder, there are few or no names ending in *-by*.

§ 60. *Signs of Slavonic occupancy.*—For the Slavonic forms, compare a map of (*say*) Poland with one of (*say*) Hesse, or Westphalia, and their general character will become apparent. Trace them from Poland westward. They will first show themselves to the exclusion of anything German, as in Posen. The two forms will then show themselves concurrently; the Slavonic prevailing in the east and the German in the west. This is the case in Mecklenburg, Altmark, and Saxony. In Holstein, Lauenburg, and Luneburg, the Slavonic forms are few and fragmentary. Roughly speaking, the traces of Slavonic occupancy are bounded by a line drawn from Kiel to Coburg.

§ 61. *Signs of Frisian and Old Saxon occupancy.*—Forms in *-um*, when found in either the Duchy of Sleswick, or Germany (*i. e.* when other than Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, or Icelandic), are, *prima facie*, evidence of either Frisian or Old Saxon (more especially of Frisian) occupancy.

In *Friesland* itself, they are at their *maximum*: the details elsewhere being as follows:—

Groningen.—In the *arrondissement* of Appingadam only we have eighteen.

Overijssel.—(a.) *Arrondissement of Zwolle*.—Three compounds of *-h-m*, viz.: *Blanken-hem*, *Windes-heiw*, and *Wils-um*—all three different; one Saxon, one German, and one Frisian.

(b.) *Arrondissement of Deventer*.—One; *Hess-um*.

(c.) *Arrondissement of Almelo*.—Three; *Ootmars-um*, *Rent-um*, and *Ross-um*. Between Almelo and Ommen a *Vriesen-veen* = *Frisian fen*.

Gelderland.—(a.) *Arrondissement of Arnhem*.—Here *Arn-hem* takes the form in *-hem*. On the contrary, *Helsum* and *Renkum* occur, and so do *Bennekom* and *Ellekom*.

(b.) *Arrondissement of Tiel*.—*Heukel-um*, *Gellic-um*, and *Ross-um*.

North Brabant.—Three or four at most.

Limburg.—Four forms, *Wess-um*, *Seven-um*, *Wans-um*, and *Otters-um*; but they occur in the northern *arrondissement* (that of Roermonde) only, and that in contact with *Groet-hem* and *Baex-hem*.

North Holland—(a.) *In the arrondissement of Amsterdam*. *Blaricum*, *Helmersum*, *Bussum*.

(b.) *In the arrondissement of Hoorn*.—*Wognum*. Notwithstanding this paucity of Frisian forms in North Holland, part of the province is called *West Friesland*.

As outlyers we have—in the parts to the north and north-west of Brunswick—*Ohr-um*, *Börs-um*, *Born-um*, *Rockl-um*, *Eil-um*, *Fitz-um*, *Ahl-um*, *Ahz-um*, *Volz-um*, *Hach-um*, *Gilz-um*, *Lechl-um*, *Eit-um*, *Watz-um*, *Saltz-dal-um*.

Forms in *-um* occur all along the coast from Embden to Cuxhaven, from the Dollart to the Elbe, as also in the islands opposite.

They occur in the Duchy of Sleswick, on its western side, and in the parts north of the Eyder, between Bredsted and *Hus-um*—*Olz-hus-um*, *Bogel-um*, *Lug-um*, &c.; this being the country of the *North Frisians*.

In the *islands* the distribution is as follows:—

(a.) In Föhr—Duns-um, Utters-um, Hedehus-um, Vits-um, Niebel-um, Baldiks-um, Vreks-um, Oevens-um, Midl-um, Alkers-um, Borgs-um, Toft-um, Klint-um, Olds-um, Duns-um.

(b.) In Sylt, Hörn-um, Mors-um, Arks-um, Keit-um, Tinn-um—all in the southern half of the island.

(c.) In northern Romö, Toft-um. In southern Romö, none.

(d.) In Fanö, none.

(e. f. g.) In Amröm, in Pelvorm, and in Nordstrand, none.

To the north of Tondern, the form becomes Danish.

§ 62. (a.) In the southern extremity of the Principality of Wal-deck is a *Sachsen-berg*, and in the centre a *Sachsen-häusen*.

(b.) Due west of Waldeck lies the Sauerland, with the watershed between the Weser and the Rhine. The Ruhr has some of its head-waters here. Now *Sauer-land* is *Suther-land*, or *Southern-land*. Yet if we look at either the Hessian area, or the Frank, it lies quite at the *northern* extremity. This is just what we have in our own island, of which the most northern county is the *Southern-land* (*Suther-land*). Why is this? Simply because the name was given by a population which viewed it from the north; viz. the Norwegians of Orkney and Shetland. Apply this view to *Sauer-land*. It is an intelligible name, if we suppose that a Saxon population gave it; but not otherwise. But in order for it to be given, the Saxon frontier must have come down as far south as the Sauerland frontier. This it touched; perhaps included.

§ 63. I submit, then, that the lines here indicated include the land of the Saxons and the Frisians as opposed to that of the Franks, the Hessians, the Thuringians, the Slavonians, and the Danes; lines enclosing

Padersborn, Detmold, Bückeburg, Callenburg, Hildesheim, Grubenhagen, the northern Hartz, Brunswick, and the parts between that Duchy and Altmark. They also contain Oldenburg, Osnaburg, Hanover, and part of Lüneburg; also the western two-thirds of Holstein, but not the eastern third; also Friesland and Westphalia.

CHAPTER XI.

GERMAN ORIGIN, ETC.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—
AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL
EVIDENCE.

§ 64. *Retrospect.*—Let us now look back upon the facts and questions of the preceding chapters, review the points from which the different parts of our subject have been contemplated, consider the connection between them, and ask what results they prepare us for.

(1.) That the English language came from north-western Germany; and (2.) that it fixed itself in England between A.D. 369, and A.D. 597, has been admitted without doubt or reservation.

But, with this ends the list of positive and admitted facts. They are few enough. And not only are they few in number, but they are as little precise as numerous. Northern Germany is a large place; the interval between A.D. 369 and A.D. 597 a long one. The commonest of the current histories tell us more than this, tell it in fewer words, and tell it in a less indefinite and roundabout manner. Be it so.

Our second chapter justifies the hesitation and circumlocution of the first, and is devoted to the exposition of some of the chief reasons which invalidate not only the current accounts, but the original *data* on which

they are founded. Doing this, it foreshadows the necessity of a different line of criticism. Special and direct evidence being wanting, we must betake ourselves to inference instead.

For the time and place under notice, we have neither maps nor descriptions; no map for Northern Germany; no description, during the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, for the North German populations. We have, however, a date, viz. A.D. 446, the date of the third Consulship of Ætius.

Taking this as a sort of central epoch, we ask three questions:—

(1.) What accounts have we in the way of external evidence, for the time nearest this date and *following* it?

(2.) What accounts have we, in the way of external evidence, for the times nearest this date and *preceding* it?

(3.) What changes took place in the interval?

The answer is,—that the notices of Northern Germany during the second century are essentially the same as those of the ninth; the difference being apparent rather than actual, and the changes which those differences imply being *nominal* rather than *real*. Hence the accounts of certain early classical, and of certain later Carlovingian writers are, to a great extent, valid for the events of the interval between A.D. 369 and A.D. 597.

§ 65. So much for the question of external evidence, or the testimony of writers. In the way of internal evidence, our chief instrument of criticism has been language—language in general, and language as exhibited in the names of places and persons,—those of places being the more important. These have given us two pretty definite and two somewhat indefinite lines of demarcation. They have given us one pretty definite line between the Danes and the Germans, and another between the Germans and the Slavonians. Between the

Franks and the Saxons the division has been less distinct. This, however, is of little importance to the English investigator, inasmuch as the Angle parts of Saxony were not those that lay on the Frank frontier. Neither has the division between the Saxons, whose language was that of the Essen Roll or the Abrenunciation, and the Angles, been very patent. From the great likelihood, however, of Angraria having lain between the two divisions, it is nearly certain that, whilst the Saxons of Germany belonged to Westphalia rather than to Eastphalia, those of England came from Eastphalia and Nordalbingia. If so, there is no need to look for Angles in any district to the South of the Teutoberger Wald. If so, the chief details that remain are those connected with the division between the Angles and the Frisians of the middle district; and it cannot be denied that they are obscure. This is because the Frisian area is discontinuous. It extends from the south northwards as far as the Weser, and that visibly. It extends from the north as far southwards as the Eyder. 'On each side, however, of the Elbe, the forms in *-um* are rare, and the evidence of the language having been wholly Frisian is inconclusive.

§ 66. Under these conclusions the result is, that the western parts of Holstein, and the north-western parts of Hanover, give the nearest approach to an original Angle area; an approximation in which the testimony of the Carolingian agrees (in the main) with the testimony of the classical writers; so that the two sorts of evidence (the external and the internal) coincide.

The further we go into fresh details and into collateral lines of reasoning, the clearer this appears.

The forms in *-hurst*, which, in England, are so prevalent in Kent and Bedfordshire, find their *maximum* in Germany, in Westphalia, and in Oldenburg, *i. e.* in the parts about Frekkenhorst and Delmenhorst.

The forms in *-um* are at the *minimum* in Holstein and the parts between the Weser and the Elbe.

The Frisian language runs north of the Eyder and it runs in a narrow strip along the western coast.

• Now, saving the Frisians of this district, the Angles were the most northern occupants of the Teutonic area; in other words they were the Germans of the Danish frontier—the Danish frontier which began at the Eyder. In Anglen (as will be seen hereafter) there may have been Angles beyond that river. Upon the whole, however, the Eyder was the Angle boundary to the north, and beyond it was Denmark, *i. e.* the *March* or boundary of the Danes.

Of all the nations to the south, the Danes looked upon the Angles as their nearest congeners. That Dan and Angul were brothers is the language of the old logographics. Between the Angle and the Danish frontiers there was nothing.

Neither was there anything between the Angles and the Slaves, the Angles being not only among the most northern, but, also, amongst the most eastern of the Germans. The two populations touched each other in Holstein; and I think the Segeburger Heath was, there or thereabouts, the boundary. This gives a line drawn from Kiel to the Bille.

Luncburg was, I think, wholly Slavonic; though to the west of the Ilmenau the Slavonic names are rare; indeed, as far as the maps which I have consulted supply them, there is only one—that of the little river Bomlitz, a feeder of the Leine, near Verden. On the other hand, it is probable that *Luneburg*, as a district, meant what its name denotes—the country of the Linones; and that the Linones were Slavonians is well known. On the eastern frontier of the Duchy their language, strangely mixed with German, was spoken during the last century.

To the north of Luneburg (*i. e.* in Lauenburg and Holstein), the particular Slavonians of the Anglo frontier were the Wagrians. I imagine that this word contains the root *-kr-*, which in *Ukraine* and *Uckermark* means March or boundary. The Slaves of the Hartz seem to have been limited to the valleys of the Helme and Wipper. In this direction, however, the frontier is obscure.

CHAPTER XII.

SPECIAL AND DIRECT EVIDENCE OF BEDA, ETC., CRITICISED.—HIS JUTES PROBABLY GOTHES.—HIS SAXONS ANGLES UNDER ANOTHER NAME.—HIS DISTRICT CALLED *ANGULUS* NOT THE MOTHER-COUNTRY OF THE ANGLES.

§ 67. As opposed to the criticism of the previous chapters, the evidence upon which the current doctrines respecting the Angle invasions are based may be called *direct* or *special*.

The palmary texts are the following; the first being from Beda.

Translation.

"They came from three of the chief peoples in Germany, viz. the Saxons, the Angles, and the Jutes. Of Jute origin are the occupants of Kent, and Wight, *i. e.* the nation which occupies the Isle of Wight, and that which, to this day, in the province of the West Saxons, is named the nation of the Jutes—opposite the Isle of Wight. From the Saxons, *i. e.* from that country which is named after the Old Saxons, came the East Saxons, the South Saxons, the West Saxons. Moreover, from the Angles, *i. e.* from that country which is called *Angulus*, and which from that time to this is reported to have been as a desert between the provinces of the Jutes and Saxons, came the East Angles, the Midland Angles, the Mercians, and all the stock of the Northumbrians."

In the original.

"Advenerant autem de tribus Germaniæ populis fortioribus, id est Saxonibus, Anglis, Jutis. De Jutarum origine sunt Cantuarii et Vec-

tuarii; hoc est ea gens, quæ Vectam tenet insulam, et ea, quæ usque hodie in provincia Occidentalium Saxonum *Jutarum* natio nominatur, posita contra ipsam insulam Vectam. De *Saxonibus*, id est ea regione, quæ nunc *Antiquorum Saxonum* cognominatur, venerunt *Orientalia Saxones, Meridiana Saxones Occidui Saxones*. Porro de *Anglis*, hoc est de illa patria, quæ *Angulus* dicitur, et ab eo tempore usque hodie manere desertus inter provincias Jutarum et Saxonum perhibetur, *Orientalia Angli, Mediterranei Angli, Mercii*; tota *Nordhumbroorum* progenies."

The following (little more than a translation from the Latin) is from the Saxon Chronicle (A.D. 449):—

"Ða comon þa men of prim meġðum Germaniæ, of Eald-Seaxum, of Anglum, of Jotum.

"Of Jotum comon Cantware and Wiltware, þæt is seo mæinð, þe nū eardap on Wiht, and þæt cyn on West-Seaxum ðe man gyt hæst Iútnacyn. Of Eald-Seaxum comon Eást-Seaxan, and Suð-Seaxan, and West-Seaxan. Of Angle comon (se á siððan stóð westig betwix Iútum and Seaxum) Eást-Engle, Middel-Angle, Mearce, and ealle Norðymbra."

"They came from three powers of Germany, from Old Saxons, from Angles, from Jutes.

"From the Jutes came the inhabitants of Kent and of Wight, that is, the race that now dwells in Wight, and that tribe amongst the West-Saxons which is yet called the Jute kin. From the Old-Saxons came the East-Saxons, and South-Saxons, and West-Saxons. From Angle (which has since always stood waste betwixt the Jutes and Saxons) came the East-Angles, Middle-Angles, Mercians, and all the Northumbrians."

Thirdly; Alfred writes—

"Comon of prym folcum þa strangestan Germaniæ, þæt of Saxum, and of Angle, and of Geatum; of Geatum fruman sindon Cantwære and Wiht-sætan, þæt is seo þeód se Wiht þat ealond on eardab."

"Came they of three folk the strongest of Germany; that of the Saxons, and of the Angles, and of the Geats. Of the Geats originally are the Kent people and the Wiht-settlers, that is the people which Wiht the Island live on."

§ 68. The objection to these notices refers to three questions:—(1) the meaning of the word *Jute*; (2) the import of the term *Saxon*; (3) the claims of the district called *Angulus* to be considered the mother-country of the English.

§ 69. *The Jutes*.—That *Jute* means the Jutlanders of

Jutland, we learn from the context; which tells us, that their country was conterminous with *Angulus*.

Now the Jutlanders, at the present moment, are *Danes*. Yet in no other part of England do we find the Danes of Jutland treated as Jutes, but, on the contrary, as ordinary Danes. In Lincolnshire, in Yorkshire, in several other counties, there were, as far as the actual population was concerned, Jutes in abundance. The name, however, by which they are designated is *Dane*. Hence, if a Dane from Jutland, when he settled in the Isle of Wight, were called a Jute, he was named in accordance with a principle foreign to the rest of the island. True Jutlanders would also have been Danes; and if they were Danes they would have been called *Dene*, and *Denisce*. Again; in Lincolnshire, in Yorkshire, in several other counties where there was an abundance of Jutes, there both was, and is, abundance of evidence to their occupancy. The names of their settlements (as aforesaid) ended, and end, in *-by*, as Grims-*by*, Whit-*by*, &c. Let any one look to any ordinary map of England, and count the names of this kind; let him, then, look to their distribution. Let him note the extent to which they appear in each and all of the districts where Danes have ever been supposed to have settled; and, then, let him note their utter absence in the parts where Beda places his Jutes. Compare Lincolnshire, which was really Danish, with Kent, Hants, and the Isle of Wight, which are only Jute, and the possibility of error will become apparent. And why should it be impossible? why should it be even improbable? Beda is, doubtless, a grave authority. But is it Beda who here speaks? All that Beda tells us, at first-hand, is the fact to which he was cotemporary, viz. the fact of their being a "*gens quæ Vectam tenet insulam, et ea quæ, usque hodie in provincia occidentalium Saxonum Jutarum natio nominatur.*" How they came there was another matter;

an ordinary piece of history, for which, perhaps, Bishop Daniel was his informant; Bishop Daniel having no personal knowledge of the event, which happened some 200 years before he was born.

- That they were *Jutæ*, in the parts under notice, seems to be a fact. Their origin from Jutland seems to be an inference: and I submit that it was an incorrect one. I submit that, as far as these *Jutæ* were Jutes, at all, they were Jutes from the opposite coast of Gaul, rather than Jutes from Jutland. If so, they were *Goths*. This I believe, then, to have been the case. Word for word, the two forms are convertible; besides which, Alfred's form is *Geat*, and in the work attributed to Asser the name, *totidem literis*, is *Gothus*.

“Osberg erat filia Oslac—qui Oslac *Gothus* erat natione, ortus enim erat de *Gothis* et *Jutis*.”

The details of the Gothic dominion in Gaul tally with this view. They begin, there or thereabouts, with the century when Ataulfus or Adolfus, having abandoned Rome, lays the foundation of a kingdom of which Arles is the capital. His power is developed at the expense of two pretenders, Constantine and Maximus, the latter supported by Gerontius; but both being, more or less, British in their political relations. Indeed, it was on British ground that the former was raised to the purple. The general who most effectively opposes them is Constantine; who raises the siege of Arles and conducts his campaign almost wholly in either the Gothic parts of Gaul or in Gothic Spain. His ally is Ataulfus: one of his legates Ulphilas, with a name pre-eminently Gothic. The details of these movements may be found in Gibbon, the authorities for them being almost wholly Greek. When we remember that such details were just those of which Beda knew the least, we see

at once the probability of his having confounded *Goths* with *Jutes*.

§ 70. *The Saxons Angles under another name.*—The text of Beda suggests a difference between the Angles and the Saxons. Is this difference real or nominal? I believe it to be nominal. I submit that the Saxons were neither more nor less than Angles under another name.

At the present moment the Welsh call the English Saxons, and it is presumed that they do so because their ancestors, the ancient Britons, did so before them.

That the Romans and Britons spoke of the Angles in the same way is highly probable. If one population called them Saxons, the other would do the same.

The name by which the *Non-romanizing* Germans of England (the Angles) were known to the Romans would, probably, be the name by which they were known to the *Romanizing* Germans (the Franks and Goths).

Now, that this name was *Saxon* is by no means a matter of conjecture: on the contrary, it is one on which we have a good deal of satisfactory evidence. That the Britons used it is inferred from the present practice of the Welsh. That the Romans used it is inferred from the *Litus Saxonicum* of the Notitia. That the Franks used it is shown in almost every page of their annals.

I submit, then, that, whilst the invaders of Britain from the North of Germany called themselves *Engles*, the Britons called them *Saxons*. The name, however, though other than English in its origin, soon became Anglicized. Thus, the country of the—

<i>Orientalis Saxones</i>	became	<i>East-Seaxe</i> ,	now	<i>Essex</i> ;
<i>Meridiani Saxones</i>	„	<i>Suð-Seaxe</i> ,	„	<i>Sussex</i> ;
<i>Occidui Saxones</i>	„	<i>West-Seaxe</i> ,	„	<i>Wessex</i> ;

all in contact with the county of Kent, in which the name probably arose.

I now add—that no *real* difference between the Angles and Saxons has ever been indicated. That undoubted Angles, like the men of Yorkshire or Northumberland, can be shown to differ from the so-called Saxons of Sussex or Essex in manners and dialect no one denies. But do they not differ as North-countrymen and South-countrymen, rather than as Saxons and Angles? Who finds any difference between Saxon Essex and Angle Suffolk?—between Saxon Middlesex and Angle Hertfordshire? Yet this is the difference required under the hypothesis that the Angles and Saxons were really different populations. Again, the king who is said to have called the whole island England, or the land of the Engles, was Egbert, king of Wessex, a Saxon rather than an Angle. We may believe that this was the case when an Emperor of Austria proposes that all Germany shall be called Prussia.

To conclude:—I suggest that the conquerors of England, who introduced the English language and gave the island its present name, bore two names.

They were called by themselves, *Angles*.

„ „ the Frisians, *Angles*.

„ „ the Danes, *Angles*.

But, by the Kelts, they were called *Saxons*.

„ Romans, „ „ *Saxons*.

„ Franks, „ „ *Saxons*.

„ Goths, „ „ *Saxons*.

Where the latter populations determined the nomenclature the latter names prevailed.

§ 71. In *one* way, however, notwithstanding the previous arguments, the Saxons may have been different from the Angles. The latter may have come *direct* from Germany: the former from the *Littus Saxonicum*. If so, the

populations of the districts in *-sex*—*Es-sex*, *Middle-sex*, *Sus-sex*, and *Wes-sex*—were only of remote, or indirect, German origin. Though I indicate this difference, I am not prepared to defend it.

§ 72. *Beda's ANGULUS*.—The statement of Beda respecting the district of which the Latin name was *Angulus*, like many of his other statements, re-appears in more than one of the authors who wrote after him.

ALFRED.

(1.)

“And be wæstan Eald-Seaxum is Albe muða and Frisland. And þanon west norð is þæt land, the man *Angle* hæf, and Sillende, and summe dæl Dena.”—*Oros*, p. 20.

“And on the west of the Old-Saxons is the mouth of the river Elbe and Friesland; and then north-west is the land which is called *Angle* and Sea-land, and some part of the Danes.”

(2.)

“He seglode to þam porte þe man hæf Hæþum; se stent betwux Winedum and Seaxum, and *Angle*, and hyrð in on Dene. . . and þa twegen dagas ær he to Hæþum come, him was on þæt steorbord Gothland and Sillende and iglanda fela. On þam landum eardodon Engle, ær hiðer on land comon.”—*Oros*, p. 23.

“He sailed to the harbour which is called Hæðum, which stands betwixt the Wends and Saxons, and *Angle*, and belongs to Denmark. . . and two days before he came to Hæðum, there was on his starboard Gothland, and Sealand, and many islands. On that land lived *Engles*, before they hither to the land came.”

The geography is clear. *Angulus* means the district which is now called *Anglen*; a triangle of irregular shape, formed by the Slie, the Flensborger Fiord, and a line drawn from Flensborg to Sleswick. It may be the size of the county of Rutland, or a little larger; and it lies on the side of the Peninsula furthest from England. Although one of the most fertile parts of Sleswick, it was likely to have been a desert; inasmuch as it was a frontier land, or March, between the Danes and the Sla-

vonians (or Wends) of the eastern half of Holstein. But it was not likely to have been the mother-country of any large body of emigrants; still less for an emigration across the German Ocean; least of all for such a one as conquered England. There is, however, no objection to the *Anglen* of Sleswick having been *part* of the country of the Angles who invaded England. The only objection lies against its having been co-extensive with the mother-country of the English. That a population sufficiently strong to have conquered and given a name to England, and sufficiently famous to have been classed amongst the leading nations of Germany, both by Beda himself and by Ptolemy before him, is to be deduced from a particular district on the frontier of Jutland rather than from northern Germany in general; from a section of the Duchy of Sleswick rather than from Holstein and Hanover at large; is unlikely.

NOTE.

On the Language of Anglen.

The statement that there is no objection to Anglen having been *part* of the land of the Angles is the only one that can be made. Nor can it be made without certain cautions and qualifications. Anglen can scarcely have belonged to the original Angle area, but, on the contrary, can only have been an outlying settlement—a settlement of certain Angles who made their way in the direction of Denmark, even as the conquerors of Britain made their way in the direction of Wales and Ireland. This is because the parts between the Angle districts of Germany were separated from the Anglen of Sleswick by the Slavonians of Holstein: whilst the western part of Sleswick itself was Frisian—the Frisians being (by the Danes at least) clearly distinguished from the Angles. Still, as certain Angles may have found their way to the

parts about the present towns of Lübek and Travemünde, and (*við* the Trave) have taken possession of certain parts of Sleswick, the Angle origin of the present occupants of Anglen is by no means improbable. Nevertheless, it is extremely doubtful.

The details of the dialects of Anglen are well known. At the beginning of the historical period, the district lay well within the limits of Denmark as opposed to Germany: inasmuch as it lay to the north of the Dannevirke, and to the north of a district wherein (at least) two runic inscriptions in pure Norse have been discovered.

1.*

Þurif rispi sten þonsi himþigi Svins eftan Erik felaga sin ies varþ dauþr þo dregjar satu um Haithabu, iar har vas sturimadr, drigr harda godr.

In Danish.

Thorlef reiste denne Steen, Svends Hjembo, efter sin Staldbroder Erik, som døde, da Heltene sade om Hedeby, han var Styremand, en suare god Helt.

In English.

Thorlef cut this stone, Svends home, after Eric's fellow his was dead hen (when) the heroes sat about (besieged) Hatheby. He was steerman, a hard good hero.

2.

Osfríðr gerði kumbl oft Sutrik sun sin . . .

In Danish.

Osfrid gjorde Høi efter Sutrik sin Søn . . .

In English.

Osfrid made (*Scotticè* gart) barrow, after Sutrik his son . . .

It also lay to the north of the Danischwald, or Danish Wood, and, *à fortiori*, to the north of the Eyder, the convenient, if not exactly the accurate, boundary between Denmark and Germany.

It also lay to the north of a series of villages ending in the characteristic termination *-by*, viz.: Haby, Nørby, Osterby, Gotheby, Hekkeby, Guby, Vindeby, and Hedeby (*Haithabu*).—To which add, from the district of Svansö, on the east, Nyby, Söby, Sonderby, &c.

* From Hallen, vol. i., pp. 9, 10.

In all these, however, the Danish language has given way to the Platt-Deutsch, so that the question as to any actual intermixture of the original Norse in the parts to the south of Anglen, has no existence in the minds of even its most zealous partizans. I use this term, because it is scarcely necessary to say that, in Denmark, the matter has assumed a serious and a political aspect.

Anglen, however, is claimed as a *mixed* district, *i. e.* as one in which the Danish and the Platt-Deutsch are spoken concurrently. There is no doubt as to this being the case. Neither is there any doubt as to the Danish being the older language. The local names ending in *-by* are (as has been shown) numerous. The introduction of the German is a matter of history. The exact date, however, of its *preponderance* is uncertain. So are the exact proportions borne by it, at the present moment, to the Danish. In respect to this I find the statement that the Church Service in Anglen was never read in Danish; in other words, that, as early as the time of the Reformation, the German was sufficiently prevalent to exclude its rival language from the reading-desk. To this, however, one of the latest and best authorities on the subject, Allen, in *Det Danske Sprogs Historie i Hertugdømmet Slesvig eller Synderjylland*, objects, giving some curious facts in a different direction. Thus, in the sixteenth century, the parishioners of Gelting complain that their pastor knows no Danish; whilst in Husby, Eskriss, and Haveltoft the registers between A.D. 1603 and A.D. 1635 contain certain Danish entries. Now, however much these facts may give us an *approximation* to a Church Service, it is not the Church Service itself; so that, upon the whole, the original statement is true, *viz.* that Anglen was the first district, north of the Slie, in which the Platt-Deutsch was the language of the preacher,

This was as early as there was any preaching in the vernacular at all.

How far the Danish still survives is another question. Recent inquiries have shown that it is anything but extinct. There is more of it in the north than the south. It is generally understood. It is spoken, when needed, by the majority. It is spoken, from choice, by few. By a few it is neither spoken nor understood. In no case, however, is it spoken to the exclusion of the Platt-Deutsch.

Though this has a greater bearing upon Danish politics than upon English philology, it is, by no means, irrelevant. The more we know what Anglen really is, the better we shall value Beda's statement concerning it. One thing is certain, viz. that, whether Danish or German, at the present moment, it shows no signs of ever having been English. The Danish is older than the German, but there is nothing older than the Danish—nothing, at least, within the range of history. Neither is there any tradition; though the belief, on the *other* side of the peninsula, that the *Frisians* are akin to the English is both correct and well founded. Neither is it certain that *Anglen* is the equivalent to *Anglia*: for which the Danish would be either *Engelland* or *Engle*. It seems rather to mean the *Angle*. At any rate Beda's term is *Angulus*, and the district itself is *Anglen*. That learned men have looked upon the dialect of the district as a mixture of Danish and Platt-Deutsch with a dash of the original Anglo-Saxon is not to be wondered at. Yet, no undoubted Anglo-Saxon element has ever been discovered in it.

CHAPTER XIII.

ELEMENTS OF THE ANGLE INVASION. — FRISIANS. —

- CHAUCI. — LONGOBARDI. — DANES. — THE GOTHS AND FRANKS. — PROBABLE OCCUPANTS OF KENT. — EARLY DANES.

§ 73. DID any other German populations, *under their own name*, join the Angle invasions? Did any of them do so under the general name of *Angle* or *Saxon*? Did any of them effect any independent settlements?

§ 74. *The Frisians.*—(a) Procopius writes that three very populous nations occupied Britain, the Angles, the Britons, and the Frisians.

(b) The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, under the year 897, runs thus :—

The armies from among the East-Anglians and from among the North-Humbrians, harassed the land of the West-Saxons chiefly, most of all by their *æscs*, which they had built many years before. Then King Alfred commanded long ships to be built to oppose the *æscs*; they were full-nigh twice as long as the others; some had sixty oars, and some had more; they were both swifter and steadier, and also higher than the others. They were shapen neither like the Frisian nor the Danish, but so as it seemed to him that they would be most efficient. Then some time in the same year, there came six ships to Wight, and there did much harm, as well as in Devon, and elsewhere along the sea-coast. Then the king commanded nine of the new ships to go thither, and they obstructed their passage from the port towards the outer sea. Then went they with three of their ships out against them; and three lay in the upper part of the port in the dry; the men were gone from them ashore. Then took they two of the three ships at the outer part of the port, and killed the men, and the other ship escaped; in that also the men were killed except five; they got away because the other ships were aground. They also were aground very disadvantageously; three lay aground on that side of the deep on which the Danish ships were aground, and all the rest upon the other side, so that no one of them could get to the others. But when the water had ebbed many furlongs from the ships, the Danish men went from their three ships to the other three which were left by the tide on their side, and then they there fought against them. There was slain Lucumon the king's reeve, and Wulfheard the Frisian, and Æbbe the Frisian, and

Æthelhere the Frisian, and Æthelferth the king's *geneat*, and of all the men, Frisians and English, seventy-two; and of the Danish men one hundred and twenty.

(c) In the life of St. Swibert we have the following passage:—"Egbertus sitiens salutem *Frisionum* et Saxonum; eo quod Angli ab eis propagati sunt."

§ 75. *Chauci*.—With the Carlovingian writers, at least, the Frisian name included something beyond the Frisians Proper, or the Frisians in the strictest sense of the term. The *Chauci* were a detail of it. Apparently, this word belongs to the classical period only, being lost when we approach the Carlovingian times. But it is only apparently. Its German form is *Hoc-ing*; at least, such is the reasonable opinion of the majority of investigators—the *-ing* being a gentile termination, and, as such, no original part of the word. As to the change from *Ch-*, to *H-* it creates no difficulty. It is the same which occurs in *Chatti* and *Hessi*. In *Attuarii*, as compared with *Chattuarii* it disappears altogether. Now the *Hocings* have a prominent position in the earliest Frisian history; or if not in the earliest Frisian history, in that cycle of legend which simulates it. In *Beowulf*, we find among the heroes—

1. Finn, the son of Folcwalda, a Frisian:
2. Hildeburg his queen, a *Hocing*:
3. Healfdene, the king of the Danes:
4. Hnæf, a *Hocing*, his vassal:
5. Hengist, a Jute, his (Healfdene's) vassal also.

These two last invade Finn's territory. Hnæf is slain; Finn's followers also. The bodies are burned. Hengist remains, and meditates vengeance; which he effects by killing Finn and carrying off his queen. The text is as follows; the translation being Mr. Kemble's. It may also be found in a version of Mr. Thorpe's as an appendix to the first volume of *Lappenburg*:—

Hroðgar's poet after the mead-bench must excite joy in the hall,

concerning Finn's descendants, when the expedition came upon them; Healfdene's hero, Hnæf the Scylding, was doomed to fall in Friesland. Hildeburh had at least no cause to praise the fidelity of the Jutes; guiltlessly was she deprived at the war-game of her beloved sons and brothers; one after another they fell wounded with javelins; that was a mournful lady. Not in vain did Hocce's daughter mourn their death, after morning came, when he under the heaven might behold the slaughterer of her son where he before possessed the most of earthly joys: war took away all Finn's thanes, except only a few, so that he might not on the place of meeting gain anything by fighting against Hengest, nor defend in war his wretched remnant against the king's thane; but they offered him conditions, that they would give up to him entirely a second palace, a hall, and throne; so that they should halve the power with the sons of the Jutes, and at the gifts of treasure every day Folcwalda's son should honour the Danes, the troops of Hengest should serve them with rings, with hoarded treasures of solid gold, even as much as he would furnish the race of Frisians in the beer-hall. There they confirmed on both sides a fast treaty of peace.

Again,—

Thence the warriors set out to visit their dwellings, deprived of friends, to see Friesland, their homes and lofty city; Hengest yet, during the deadly-coloured winter, dwelt with Finn, boldly, without casting of lots he cultivated the land, although he might drive upon the sea the ship with the ringed prow; the deep boiled with storms, wan against the wind, winter locked the wave with a chain of ice, until the second year came to the dwellings; so doth yet, that which eternally, happily provideth weather gloriously bright. When the winter was departed, and the bosom of the earth was fair, the wanderer set out to explore, the stranger from his dwellings. He thought the more of vengeance than of his departing over the sea, if he might bring to pass a hostile meeting, since he inwardly remembered the sons of the Jutes. Thus he avoided not death when Hunláf's descendant plunged into his bosom the flame of war, the best of swords; therefore were among the Jutes, known by the edge of the sword, what warriors bold of spirit Finn afterwards fell in with, savage sword slaughter at his own dwelling; since *Guðláf* and *Osláf* after the sea-journey mourned the sorrow, the grim onset: they avenged a part of their loss; nor might the cunning of mood refrain in his bosom, when his hall was surrounded with the men of his foes. Finn also was slain. The king amidst his band, and the queen was taken; the warriors of the Scyldings bore to their ships all the household wealth of the mighty king which they could find in Finn's dwelling, the jewels and carved gems; they over the sea carried the lordly lady to the Danes—led her to their people. The lay was sung, the song of the glee-man, the joke rose again, the noise from the benches grew loud, cupbearers gave the wine from wondrous vessels.

Another poem of the same character of *Beowulf*, only more fragmentary, is the battle of *Finnesburg*. In this, *Ordlaf*, *Guðlaf*, *Hnæf*, and *Hengist* are again mentioned,—

• “Ordlaf and Guðlaf,
And *Hengest* self
Followed in his tract.” •

These extracts bear upon the nationality and personality of *Hengist*, rather than upon the Frisian element of the Angle invasion. It should, however, be added, that one account, at least, makes *Hengist* no Jute, but a Frisian.

In the way of internal evidence we have several compounds of *Fris* on our maps; *e. g.* *Frieston* and *Frisby*. Again, the German Ocean is occasionally called *Mare Fresicum*.

§ 76. *The Longobards*.—It is an undoubted fact that the numerous glosses of the Lombard laws belong to the High; rather than the Low, German group of dialects. They are Bavarian or Burgundian rather than Frisian, Old Saxon, or Angle. It is equally true that this High-German character is a presumption in favour of the Longobards having been other than Angle in their immediate ethnological connections. On the other hand, however, it may safely be said that, with this single fact, the evidence in favour of the Longobardi being High-Germans begins and ends. Everything else points to an Angle affinity.

(a) The mention of the Angli of Tacitus follows that of the Longobardi.

(b) The fine for killing a man is the same in the Angle and the Lombard laws.

(c) The mythic hero *Sceaf*, with whose strange history the Angle poem of *Beowulf* begins, is named in the *Traveller's Song* as the king of the Longobards.

Síge-here lengest
Sæ-denum weöld,

Sigehere longest
The Sea-Danes ruled,

Hnæf Hocingum,
Sceaƿa Long-beardum.

(l. 64.)

Hnæf the Hocings,
Sceaƿ the Longbeards, &c.

(d) The *morgengabe*, a pecuniary settlement made by the husband upon the wife the morning after marriage, is Angle and Lombard.

(e) The Langobardi of Ptolemy are placed to the west of the *Suevi Angli*—Σουήβοι οἱ Ἀγγεῖλοι.

(f) The characteristic Anglo-Saxon names *Edwin*, *Eadwine*, *Ealfwine*, *Clapa*, and *Edgar*, are the names of the first four Lombard kings—viz. *Audouin*, *Alboin*, *Clepho*, and *Autharis*. With *Audouin* and *Alboin* the identification is less that of the modern speculator than that of the Anglo-Saxons themselves.

Swylæ ic was on Eatule
mid *Ælfwine*.

Bearn *Eadwines*.

As I was in Italy
with *Ælfwin*.

Bairn of *Eadwin*.

Taken by itself, all this connects the Langobards with the Angles. It cannot, however, be taken by itself. The great complication engendered by the High-German character of the Lombard glosses cannot, for an instant, be ignored. I submit, however, that the dynasty which made the laws, was not the dynasty of the first kings; in other words, that the Lombard of the glosses is not the true Lombard at all, but rather Bavarian. Let us look at the history of the reign of Theudelinda (and we need go no further than Gibbon) for evidence upon this point. Audouin and Alboin (Edwin and Elfwin) are father and son. Clepho, who succeeds the father, is a noble, raised to the throne by election; Autharis is his son: a minor. During his minority there is the anarchical rule of what is called the Thirty Tyrants. As Autharis grows up he has to fight against both Frank and Bavarian invaders. He eventually defeats them: and marries

Theudelinda, a daughter of Garibald, King of Bavaria. He survives his wedding but one year. On his death, the dynasty changes. But, *before this change of dynasty*, there are no written laws. Meanwhile, there is the express evidence of Paulus Diaconus that

(a) During the reign of Autharis, 20,000 men left Italy, and returned to their original homes; that

(b) These men were *Saxons*; and that

(c) The district to which they returned was (to say the least) in Ostphalia, *i. e.* in the Angle division of Saxonia.

§ 77. *The Goths probable occupants of Kent, and parts of Hampshire.*—See § 69.

§ 78. *The Franks probable occupants of Kent.*—There may have been Franks in Kent as well as Goths. One fact in favour of such having been the case lies in—

(a) The extract from Mamertinus. (See § 5.)

(b) The name *Kent*, which is no compound of the word *Seaxe* or *Saxon*, like *Sus-sex*, *Es-sex*, &c.—though it abuts upon districts so named. Hence, the easiest way of accounting for the compounds, in *-sex*, and their limitation to the south of England, is to suppose that they were the names by which the districts which bore them were known in Kent;—the Franks being the population who, of all the Germans, most eschewed the use of the word *Angle* and most used the word *Saxon*. *Saxon* was a name which a Frank population would give to its neighbours, even if they were *Angle* in the strictest sense of the term. If a Frank had given a name to *East-Anglian* Suffolk, it would have been *Es-sex*.

(c) The name *Hhlothære*, as that of a king of Kent, is eminently Frank, and not at all Angle.

(d) Kent is divided into *Lathes*.—The Latin term *Læti* was a word belonging to the military nomenclature of Rome during the fourth century, as well as earlier and later.

It applied to the parts opposite Britain—viz. Gaul and Western Germany. It denoted a certain kind of military retainers; the service in which they were being the Roman. Julian, in Ammianus (xx. 8) writes of them thus:—"Equos præbebo Hispanos, et miscendos gentilibus atque scutariis adolescentes *Lætos* quosdam, cis Rhenum editam barbarorum progeniem, vel certe ex dedititiis, qui ad nostra desuescunt." Zosimus gives the form *Λετοί*. He speaks of the emperor as being a barbarian by blood, who by residence amongst the *Λετοί*, a Gallic nation, acquired some Latin cultivation (2, 54). — *Μαγνέντιος, γένος μὲν ἔλκων ἀπὸ βαρβάρων, μετοικήσας δὲ εἰς Λετοῖς, ἔθνοϊ Γαλατικόν, παιδείας τῆς Λατίνων μετασχών.* The *Frank* *Læti* were settled by Maximianus, as we learn from Eumenius (*Panegyric. Constant. Cæs.* A.D. 296):—"Tuo—natu Nerviorum et Treverorum arva jacentia *Lætus* postliminio restitutus et receptus in leges *Francus* excoluit." The *Notitia* has a long list of them—

Præfectus *Lætorum* Teutoniciarum, Carnunto Senoniæ Lugdunensis.

Præfectus *Lætorum* Batavorum et gentilium Suevorum, *Bajocas** et Constantiæ Lugdunensis secundæ.

Præfectus *Lætorum* gentilium Suevorum, Cenomannos Lugdunensis tertiæ.

Præfectus *Lætorum Francorum*, Redonas Lugdunensis tertiæ.

Præfectus *Lætorum* Lingonensium, per diversa dispersorum Belgicæ primæ.

Præfectus *Lætorum* Actorum, Epuso Belgicæ primæ

Præfectus *Lætorum* Nerviorum, Fanomartis Belgicæ secundæ.

Præfectus *Lætorum* Batavorum Nemetacensium, Atrebatibus Belgicæ secundæ.

Præfectus *Lætorum* Batavorum Contraginsium, Noviomago Belgicæ secundæ.

Præfectus *Lætorum* gentilium, Remos et Silvanectas Belgicæ secundæ.

Præfectus *Lætorum* Lagensium, prope Tungros Germaniæ secundæ.

Præfectus *Lætorum* gentilium Suevorum, Arvernos Aquitanicæ primæ.

Zeuss (*v. Leti*), to whom all the texts that have been laid before the reader are due, concludes with a notice

* Observe the word *Bajocas* = *Bayeux*.

touching the question of the Kentish *lathes* most closely. The Theodosian Code states "That the lands appointed to the *Læti*, who were removed to them, were called *terræ Læticiæ*." Such a word, then, as *lathe* may have grown out of [*terra*] *Læticiæ*. That such existed in Romano-Keltic Gaul has been shown abundantly. That they also existed in Romano-Keltic Britain (especially in the parts nearest to Gaul) is probable.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SCANDINAVIAN SETTLEMENTS IN BRITAIN.—THE DANES.—THE NORWEGIANS.—THE NORSE AND TEUTONIC ELEMENTS OF THE NORMAN FRENCH.

§ 79. *The Danes*.—When the Angles called a place a *tún*, or *town*, the Danes called it a *by*. When the Angles said *Newton*, the Danes said *Newby*.

When the Angles said *chester* (as in *Dorchester*), or *cester* (as in *Bicester*), the Danes said *caster*; e.g. *Tadcaster*, *Doncaster*, &c.

The Danes said *Sk-* rather than *Sh-*, i. e. *Skip-ton*, rather than *Ship-ton*.

The Danes said *Ca-*, rather than *Ch-*, i. e. *Carl-ton* rather than *Charl-ton*.

The Danes said *Orm* rather than *Worm*, as in *Orms-head*.

The Danes said *Kirk* rather than *Church*; as in *Orms-kirk*.

With these facts as a preliminary we may study the distribution of the Danes. From Lincolnshire, where the forms in question are at their *maximum*, we trace them into Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire, and Derbyshire, as far as Rugby in Warwickshire, and Ashby in Northamp-

tonshire. In Yorkshire they seem to have followed the western feeders of the Ouse up to its watershed, which they crossed, and, from the valley of the Eden in Cumberland, spread themselves into those of the Solway, the Lune, the Mersey, and the Dee. Faint traces of them occur in North, and fainter ones still in South, Wales. In the Isle of Man they are conspicuous.

Again—a block of land at the junction of Norfolk and Suffolk, on the lower course of the river Waveney, shows, in its numerous villages ending in *-by*, signs of Danish occupancy.

The Angle name of the present town of *Whitby* in Yorkshire was *Streoneshalch*. The present name is Danish.

The Angle name of the capital of Derbyshire was *Northweorthig*. The present name is Danish.

Several words in the northern dialects are Norse rather than Angle.

<i>Provincial.</i>	<i>Common Dialect.</i>	<i>Norse</i>
Braid	<i>Resemble</i>	Braas
Eldin	<i>Firing</i>	Eld
Forc	<i>Waterfall</i>	Fors
Gar	<i>Make</i>	Göra
Gill	<i>Ravine</i>	Gil
Greet	<i>Weep</i>	Grata
Ket	<i>Carriage</i>	Kiöd
Sait	<i>Seek</i>	Led
Lathe	<i>Barn</i>	Lade
Lile	<i>Little</i>	Lil

The following inscription is Danish rather than pure Anglo-Saxon. It appears on a tomb in Alborough Church, in the East Riding of Yorkshire.

Ulf het aræran cyrice for *hanum* and for Gunthara saula.
Ulf bid rear the church for him, and for Gunthar's soul.

Ulf and *hanum* are Norse forms.

The Anglo-Saxon mode of expressing descent was by means of the termination *-ing*; so that the son of Edgar

would not be *Edgarson*, but *Edgaring*. Yet the compounds in *-son* are pre-eminently common in the present English; as they are in Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Feroic, and Icelandic. This looks as if our numerous patronymics like *Ander-son*, *Thomp-son*, *John-son*, *Nel-son*, &c., were of Danish, rather than Angle origin. Nevertheless, in the Anglo-Saxon charters we find the following passage:—"ministro qui *Bondan sunu* appellatur cognomine." On the other hand, however, the grant is one of Canute's, for at the end of it we find in Anglo-Saxon: "Ðis is ǫára VII. hida bók tó Hanitúne ǫe Cnut cyning gebócode *Leófwine Bondan sunu* on éce yrfæ."—"This is the book (deed) of the seven hydes at Hannington, which Cnut, the king, granted to *Leofwine Bondeson* for a heritage for ever."

§ 80. The Scandinavians who settled in Great Britain were not exclusively Danes. Some were Norwegians. Can we separate the one from the other? Yes. For some reason or other, the termination *-by*, so common in Denmark, is rare in Norway, and wholly wanting in the Norwegian colony of Iceland. It is, also, all but wanting in Durham, Northumberland, Scotland, Orkney, Shetland, the Hebrides, and Ireland. The inference from this is, that, whilst the parts south of the Tees, so far as they were Norse at all, were Danish rather than Norwegian, the parts to the north of that river were Norwegian rather than Danish. The Danes crossed England; the Norwegians sailed round it. In the Isle of Man the two streams met. The same seems to have been the case in Ireland; where the term *-ford*=*an arm of the sea* (as in *Carling-ford*, *Strang-ford*) is (along with other local names) Scandinavian.

The words thus introduced constitute the *direct* Scandinavian of our language. Whether there be much or little of this will be considered in the sequel. At present it is only necessary to notice the word *direct*.

§ 81. *Indirect Norse Elements*.—The Normans came from Normandy; but as Normandy took its name from the Northmen who invaded it, it is probable that certain words, though French in their immediate, may be Norse in their remote, origin. Carried from Scandinavia into Normandy, they may, by the Norman Conquest, have been carried farther still, and so have found their way into England. Such words give us an *indirect* Norse element. Whether few or many, they have yet to be sought for. They are noticed, however, in order that attention may be drawn to the analysis of the Anglo-Norman form of speech; which is, by no means, purely and simply French.

In the first place, it may contain Keltic elements; either from the original Gallic or from the neighbouring province of Brittany.

In the next, it belongs to one of the most German districts of France: the German elements being of a very complex kind.

(a.) Normandy was, more or less, *Saxon*; i. e. a portion of the occupants of the *littus Saxonicum* extended themselves as far as the parts about Bayeux, being noticed under the name of *Saxones Bajocassini*. There is also a notice, in a capitulary of Charles the Bald, A.D. 853, of the *Otlinga* (?) *Saxonica*.

(b.) It was more or less Scandinavian, as has been already stated: to which it may be added that, in its Scandinavian character, it was Danish rather than Norwegian. This, however, is not the common opinion; the common opinion being that Rolf, Rollo, or Rou, the first conqueror, who died A.D. 931, was a son of Rognvald, Earl of Orkney, a Norwegian. The evidence, however, is that of Snorro Sturleson, who wrote as late as the 13th century. His statement seems to have arisen out of the word *Normannus*, which, in *his* time, applied to a Norwegian rather than a

Dane. In the ninth and tenth centuries, it applied to Danes and Norwegians indifferently. Meanwhile, the French accounts always call the conquerors of Normandy *Danes*; a name which they would scarcely give to a Norwegian proper.

(c.) Thirdly, it was the occupancy of those Germans whose chiefs bore the names of *William*, *Henry*, and *Richard*, the names of certain dukes of Normandy, and certain kings of England. Who these were is uncertain. It is only certain that the names under notice, though the names of the successors of Rollo, are not Scandinavian. Neither are they Angle. Neither are they exactly Frank. I have given reasons elsewhere for believing that these were Goths.

§ 82. With these preliminaries we may analyze the German elements of the Anglo-Norman. They chiefly consist of local names—names in which the Teutonic character is greatly disguised.

The *-tot*, in *Yvetot*, *Raffetot*, *Garnetot*, *Criquetot*, *Houdetot*, *Louvetot*, *Ansetot*, *Turretot*, *Eculetot*, *Tiboutot*, *Pretot*, *Valletot*, and *Sassctot* (*Saxon*) = the *-toft* in *Wigtoft*, *Braytoft*, &c.

The *-bec*, in *Bolbec*, *Caudbec*, *Carbec*, *Foulbec*, *Robec*, &c. = the *beck* in *Welbeck*, &c.

The *-fleur* in *Harfleur*, *Barfleur*, *Vittefleur*, *Figucfleur*, &c. = the *-fleet* in *Northfleet*, &c.

The *-ey* in *Guernsey*, *Jersey*, *Alderney*, *Chausey* = the *-ey* in *Orkney*, &c.

The *-dale* and *-tal* in *Oudale*, *Crodal*, *Danestal* (*Dane*), *Darnetal*, *Dieppedal*, *Croixdal*, *Bruquedalle*, *Grandes Dalles*, and *Petites Dalles*, &c. = the *-dale* in *Coverdale*, &c.

The *-gard* in *Auppegard* and *Epegard* = the English *-garth*, &c.

Houlme, near Rouen = *holm*.

The forest of *Eskoves* = *skov* = *wood*.

Finally, the *-beuf* in *Quillebeuf*, *Painbeuf*, *Marbeuf*, *Criquebeuf*, &c. = the *-by* in *Grimsby*, &c.

This last form is exclusively Norse. The others are either Norse or German.

CHAPTER XV.

AFFINITIES OF THE ENGLISH WITH THE OTHER LANGUAGES OF GERMANY AND WITH THOSE OF SCANDINAVIA.

§ 83. Over and above the Old Saxon and Frisian forms of speech, the relations of which to the Anglo-Saxon have been so fully noticed, there are others similarly, though less closely, allied.

§ 84. *Dutch of Holland and Low-German*.—The first of these is the—

DUTCH OF HOLLAND.

MARK, chap. i.

1. Het begin des evangelies van Jesus Christ, den Zoon van God.
2. Gelijk geschreven is in de Profeten : ziet, Ik zend mijnen Engel voor uw aangezicht, die uwen weg voor u heen bereiden zal.
3. De stem des roependen in de woestijn : bereidt den weg des Heeren, maakt zijne paden regt !
4. Johannes was doopende in de woestijn, en predikende den doop der bekeering tot vergeving der zonden.
5. En al het Joodsche land ging tot hem uit, en die van Jerúzalem ; en werden allen van hem gedoopt in the rivier de Jordaan, belijdende hunne zonden.
6. En Johannes was gekleed met kemelshaar, en met eenen lederen gordel om zijne lendenen, en at sprinkhannen en wilden honig.
7. En hij predikte, zeggende : na mij komt, die sterker is dan ik, wien ik niet waardig ben, nederbukkende, den riem zijner schoenen te ontbinden.
8. Ik heb ulieden wel gedoopt met water, maar hij zal u doopen met den Heiligen Geest.

Of the Provincial Platt-Deutsch specimens are given in chapters VII. and VIII.

§ 85.

MODERN HIGH-GERMAN.

(1.)

FROM LESSING'S FABLES.

HERKULES.

Als Herkules in den Himmel aufgenommen ward, machte er seinen gruss unter allen Göttern der Juno zuerst. Der ganze Himmel und Juno erstaunte darüber. "Deiner Feindin," rief man ihm zu, "begegnest du so vorzüglich?" "Ja, ihr selbst;" erwiderte Herkules. "Nur ihre Verfolgungen sind es, die mir zu den Thaten Gelegenheit gegeben, womit ich den Himmel verdienet habe."

Der Olymp billigte die Antwort des neuen Gottes, und Juno ward versöhnt.

In English.

As Hercules in the Heaven up-taken was, made he his greeting, under (among) all Gods, to Juno at (to) first. The whole Heaven and Juno were astonished thereon (over). "Thy female enemy (fiend)," cried they him to, "meetest thou so prefcvably?" "Yes, herself," answered Hercules, "only her persecutions are it, which me to the deeds opportunity (have) given, wherewith I the Heaven earned have."

The Olympus approved the answer of the new God, and Juno was reconciled.

(2.)

FROM HERDER.

Horch, horch die Lerch' am Himmelsthür singt,
 Die liebe Sonn' wacht auf;
 Aus allen Blümkelchen trinkt
 Sie schon ihr öpfer auf.
 Das Hochzeitknöpfchen freundlich winkt,
 Und thut sein Äuglein auf.
 Was hold und lieb ist, freundlich blinkt,
 Wach schönes Kind wach auf,
 Wach auf;
 Wach schönes Kind wach auf.

Literally.

Hark ! Hark ! the lark at Heaven's door sings,

The dear (*loved*) Sun wakes up ;

Out of all bloom-chalices drinks

She (the *sun*, which is feminine) already their offering up

The batchelor's button friendly looks.
 And does its eye-ling up (=opens little eye).
 What gracious and dear is friendly winks,
 Wake, fair child, wake up.
 Wake up, &c.

(3.)

From New Testament, MARK i. 1—8.

1. Diess ist der Anfang des Evangelii von Jesu Christo, dem Sohne Gottes.

2. Als geschrieben stehet in den Propheten: Siehe, Ich sende meinen Engel vor dir her, der da bereite deinen Weg vor dir.

3. Es ist eine Stimme eines Predigers in der Wüste: Bereitet den Weg des Herrn, machet Seine Steige richtig.

4. Johannes der war in der Wüste, taufte und predigte von der Taufe der Busse, zur Vergebung der Sünden.

5. Und es gieng zu ihm hinaus das ganze Jüdische Land, und die von Jerusalem, und liessen sich alle von ihm taufen im Jordan, und bekanten ihre Sünden.

6. Johannes aber war bekleidet mit Kameelshaaren. und mit einem ledernen Gürtel um seine Lenden, und ass Heuschrecken un wilden Honig;

7. Und predigte und sprach: Es kommt einer nach mir, der ist starker, denn ich, dem ich nicht genugsam bin, dass ich mich vor ihm bücke, und die Riemen seiner Schuhe auflöse.

8. Ich taufte euch mit Wasser, aber er wird euch mit dem heiligen Geiste taufen.

§ 86. *Old and Middle High-German.*—In its older forms the High-German was spoken in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, in Suabia, Bavaria, and Franconia. It is in the old High-German that the *Krist* of Otfrid, the *Psalms* of Notker, the *Canticle* of Willeram, the *Glosses* of Kero, the *Vita Annonis*, &c., are composed.

KRIST, i. 12. (Edit. Graff.)

Tho uuarun thar in lante hirta haltente;

Thes fehes datun uuarta uuidar fianta.

Zi in quam boto sconi, engil scinenti;

Joh uuurtun sie inliuhte fon himilsgen lichte.

Forahtun sie in tho gahun so sinan anasahun;

Joh hintarquamun harto thes Gotes boten uuorto.

Sprah ther Gotes boto sar. "Ih scal íú sagen uuuntar.

Ju scal sin fon Gote heil; nales forahta nihein.

Ih scal iu sagen imbot, gibot ther himilisgo Got;
 Ouh nist ther er gihorti so fronisg arunti.
 Thes uuiridit uuorolt sinu zi euuidon blidu,
 Joh al gischaft thi u in uuorolti thesa erdun ist ouh dretenti
 Niuuui boran habet thiz lant then himilисgon Heilant;
 The ist Druhtin Krist guater fon iungeru muater.
 In Bethleem thiue kuninga thie uuarun alle thanana,
 Fon in uuard ouh giboran iu sin muater magad seonu.
 Sagen ih fú, guate man, uuio ir nan sculut findan,
 Zeichen ouh gizami thuruh thaz seltsani.
 Zi theru burgi faret hinana, ir findet, so ih fú sageta,
 Kind niuuui boranaz in kripphun gilegitaz."
 Tho quam unz er zin tho sprah engilo heriscaf,
 Himilisgu menigi, sus alle singenti—
 "In himilriches hohi si Gote gualliche;
 Si in erdu fridu ouh allen thie fol sin guates uuillen."

The same, in English.

*
 Then there was in the land herdsmen feeding:
 Of their cattle they made watch against foes.
 To them came a messenger fair, an angel shining,
 And they became lit with heavenly light.
 They feared, suddenly as on him they looked;
 And followed much the words of God's messenger:
 Spake there God's messenger strait, "I shall to you say wonders.
 To you shall there be from God health; fear nothing at all.
 I shall to you say a message, the bidding of the heavenly God:
 Also there is none who has heard so glad an errand.
 Therefore becomes this world for ever blythe,
 And all creatures that in the world are treading this earth.
 Newly borne has this land the heavenly Savior,
 Who is the Lord Christ, good, from a young mother.
 In Bethleem, of the kings they were all thence—
 From them was also born his mother, a maid fair,
 I say to you, good men, how ye him shall find,
 A sign and token, through this wonder.
 To your burgh fare hence, ye find, so as I to you said,
 A child, new born, in a crib lying."
 Then came, while he to them spake, of angels a host,
 A heavenly retinue, thus all singing:
 "In the heavenly kingdom's highth be to God glory;
 Be on earth peace also to all who are full of God's will."

The Middle High-German ranges from the thirteenth century to the Reformation.

§ 87. *Mæso-Gothic*.—Certain Germans sacked Rome under Alaric, and succeeded to the empire of Augustulus under Theodoric. Of their language we have a specimen, not later than the sixth century; and as no Anglo-Saxon work is of equal antiquity, this is considered to be the oldest of all the German tongues.

MARK, chap. i.

1. ANASTODEINS aivaggeljons iesuis xristaus sunaus gups. sve gameliþ ist
2. in esaī in praufetau. sai. Ik insandja aggilu meinana faura þus. saei gamanveip vig þeinana faura þus. stibna vopjandins in aupidai.
4. manveip vig frauþins. raihtos vaurkeip staigos gups unsaris. vas iohannes daupjands in aupidai jah merjands daupein idreigos du afa-
5. geinni fravaurhte. jah usiddedun du imma all iudaialand jah iairusau-lymeis jah daupidai vesun allai in iaurdane awai fram imma andhaitan-
6. dans fravaurhtim scinaim. vasuþ-þan iohannes gavasips taglam ulbandaus jah gairda filleina hi hup seinana jah matida þramsteins jah milip
7. haiþivisk jah merida qipands. qimip swinþozu mis sa afar mis. þize-
8. ik ni im vairþs anahneivands andbindan skaudaraip skohe is. aþþan ik daupja izvis is vatin. ip is daupcip izvis in ahmin veihamma.

EXPLANATION.

Anastodeins, beginning, *lit.*, up-standing—*ga-meliþ*, written. The *ga* is the sign of the participle: one word in English preserves it, viz. *y-clept*=*called*; A. S. *clepian*=*to call*—*aggilu*, ἄγγελος—*gamanveip*, prepare—*stibna*, voice; German, *stimme*—*vopjandins*, crying; weep-ing—*aupidai*, German, *ode*=*waste*.—*Fanins*, of the Lord, one of the many Slavonic words in Ulphilas=*Pan*=*dominus*—*staigos*, ways=German, *steig*; Danish, *stie*=*way*—*daupjands*, baptize=*dip*—*merjands*, proclaiming, preaching—*idreigos*, repentance. This has been looked upon as a Keltic word—*aflageina*, away-laying—*fravaurhte*, of sins; *foreworks*; the *fore*, as in *forswear*—*usiddjedun*, out-goed, out-yode—*awai*, water, river; *aha*, Old German, *aa*, Norse—*andhaitandans*; *and*=*coram*, *hait*—*voco*, as in *hight*=*is called*, bears the name=*proclaiming*, *confessing*;—*gavasips*, clothed; from *vasjan*=*to clothe*—*taglam*, hair (word for word); *tail*, *tregel*. A. S.—*ulbandaus* (word for word), *elephant*—*gairda*, *filleina*—*fell* (as in *fell-monger*), girdle—*hup*, hips—*þramsteins*, twigs (such the translation, not *grasshoppers*)—*mileþ haiþivisk*, heath-honey;—*qipands*, saying (*queathing*, as in *quoth*, *bequeathe*)—*swinþozu*, stronger, A. S. *swiðe*=*very*, *sa*=*who*;—*anahneivands*, stooping, bending (*kneeling*);—*skaudaraip*, latchet;—*izvis*, you;—*vatin*, water; Lithuanic, *wandu*; Danish, *vand*; Swedish, *vatn*;—*ahmen*, spirit;—*veihamma*, holy.

§ 88. *The Scandinavian languages.*—Allied to each other, and allied to the languages of Germany, are the following forms of speech; forms of speech which we may call Scandinavian, or Norse:—

1. The Icelandic of Iceland; closely akin to which is the

(a.) Feroic of the Feroe Isles; and also

(b.) Several of the more archaic provincial dialects of Norway and Sweden.

2. The literary language of Sweden, and

3. The literary language of Denmark and Norway.

§ 89. *The literary Danish.*—This is Norwegian as well.

SPECIMEN.

1.

Kong Christian stod ved høien Mast,

I Røg og Damp;

Hans Værges hamrede saa fast,

At Gothens Hjem og Hjerne brast;

Da sank hvert fiendtligt Speil og Mast

I Røg og Damp.

Flye, skreg de, flye, hvad flygte kan!

Hvo staaer for Danmarks Christian

I Kamp?

Niels Juel gav Agt paa Stormens Brag

Nu er det Tid!

Han heisede det røde Flag,

Og slog paa Fienden Slag i Slag;

Da Skreg de Høit blandt Stormens Brag:

Nu er det Tid!

Flye, Skreg de, hver, som veed et Skjull!

Hvo kan bestaae for Danmarks Juel

I Strid?

Du Nordhav! Glimt af Vessel brød

Din mørke Skye.

Da tyede Kæmper til dit Skjød;

Thi med ham ligned' Skræk og Død.

Fra Vallen hørtes Vraal, som brød

Din tykke Skye.

Fra Danmark lyner Tordenskjold;

Hver give sig i Himlens Vold,

Og flye!

Du Danskes Vei til Roes og Magt,
 Sortladne Hav!
 Modtog din Ven, som uforsagt
 Tör möde Faren med Foragt,
 Saa stolt, som du, mod Stormens Magt,
 Sortladne Hav!
 Og rask igjennem Larm og spil
 Og Kamp og Seier för mig til
 Min Grav!

In English.

(1.)

King Christian stood by high-*the* mast
 In reek and damp,
 His weapon hammered so fast
 That Gothland's helms and brains burst;
 Then sank each hostile (fiendlike) stern and mast
 In reek and damp.
 Fly, shrieked they, fly, what fly can:
 Who stands against Denmark's Christian
 In battle?

Niel Juel gave heed on storms-*the* crash,
 Now is it time.
 He hoists the red flag,
 Ek, slew on fiend-*the* blow, on blow,
 Then shrieked they high amid storms-*the* crash,
 Now is it time,
 Fly, shrieked they, who knows a shelter:
 Who can stand against Denmark's Juel
 In fight?

O North Sea! flash of Vessel broke
 Thy murky cloud (sky):
 Then took refuge warriors (*champions* in thy bosom;
 For with him flashed fright and death.
 From battle-fields, heard-*was* cry which broke
 Thy thick cloud (sky).
 From Denmark flashes Tordenskiold!
 Each give himself in Heaven's power (wealding)
 And fly.

Thou Dane's way to glory and might,
 Dark Sea!
 Accept (*take in meeting*) thy friend, who reckless
 Dare meet danger with contempt,

So proud as thou, against storms-*the* might,
 Dark Sea!
 And swift through noise and music,
 And fight and victory bear me to (*til*)
 My grave.

(2.)

NORWEGIAN NATIONAL SONG (*concluding stanzas*).

Frihedens Tempel i Normandens Dale
 Stander saa herligt i Ly af hans Fjeld;
 Frit tør han tænke, og frit tør han tale,
 Frit tør han virke til Norriges Held.

Fuglen i Skove,
 Nordhavets Vove

Friere er ei end Norriges Mand;
 Villig dog lyder han selvgivne Love,
 Trofast mod Konning og Fædreneland.

Elskede Land med de skybiede Djerger,
 Frugtbare Dale og fiskrige Kyst!
 Troskab og Kjærlighed fro vi Dig sværge!
 Kalder Du, bløde vi for Dig med Lyst.

Evig Du stande,
 Elskte Blandt Lande!

Frit som den Storm, der omsuser Dit Fjeld;
 Og medens Bølgen omsnoer Dine Straunde,
 Stedse Du voxer i Hæder og Held!

In English.

Freedom's temple in Normans-the dales
 Stands so noble in lee of his rock (fell)
 Free dares he think, and free dares he speak,
 Free dares he work til Norway's weal.

Bird (*fowl*)-the in woods (*shaws*)
 North-sea's-*the* waves

Freer is not than Norway's man;
 Willing, however, obeys he self-given laws
 True-fast towards king and fatherland.

Loved land with the sky-high hills (bergs),
 Fruitful valleys, and fish-rich coast!
 Truth and love glad we for thee swear;
 Callest thou, bleed we for thee with pleasure.

Ever thou stand
 Loved amongst lands,

Free as the storm that roars round thy fell;
 And (eke) whilst billow-the laps round thy strand,
 Ever thou wax in praise and welfare.

§ 90. *The literary Swedish.*—*From Frithiof's Saga, Canto xvii.*

Kund Ring han satt i högbank om julen och drack mjöd,
 Hos honom sett hans drottning så hvit och rosenröd.
 Som vår och höst dem båda man såg bredvid hvarann,
 Hon var den friska våren, den kulna höst var han.

Då trädde uti salen en okänd gubbe in,
 Från hufvud och till fötter han insvept var i skinn.
 Han hade staf i handen och lutad sågs han gå,
 Men högre än de andra den gamle var ändå.

Han satte sig på bänken längst ned vid salens dörr;
 Der är de armas ställe ännu, som det var förr.
 De hofmän logo smädligt och sågo till hvarann,
 Och pekade med fingret på luden björnakinnsman.

Då ljungar med två ögon den främmande så hvasst,
 Med eua handen grep han en ungersven i hast,
 Helt varligen han vände den hofman upp och ned
 Då tystnade de andro; vi hade gjort så med.

In English.

King Ring he sat in high-bench at Yule (*Christmas*), eke drank mead,
 By him sat his queen so white and rosy-red.
 As Spring and Autumn (*harvest*) them both man saw aside by each other,
 She was the fresh spring, the chill harvest was he.

Then trod out-in hall-*the* an unknown (*unkenned*) old-man in;
 From head and (*eke*) to feet he covered was in skin;
 He had staf in hand-*the*, eke bent was-seen he (*to*) go,
 But higher than the others the old man was still.

He sat him on bench-*the* along below by halls-*the* door;
 There is the poor's place (*stall*) still-now, as that was before.
 The court-men laughed scornfull, and saw till each-other;
 And pointed with finger-*the* at ragged bear-skin man.

Then flashes with two eyes the stranger so sharp,
 With one hand he griped a young-swain in haste.
 Right (*whole*) tenderly he turned the court-man up and down (*netter*),
 Then kept silent the others; we had done (*gar Scoticé*) with (also).

§ 91. *The Icelandic and Feroic.*—This is remarkable for the small extent to which it has changed since the

thirteenth century, with the written language of which the modern Icelandic closely agrees.

(1.)

Icelandic (Fareyínga-Saga—Ed. Mohnike).

Ok nú er þat eitthvert sinn um sumarit, at Sigmundur mælti til þoris : “Hvat mun verða, þo at við farim í skóg þenna, er hér er norðr frá garði?” Þórir svarar : “á því er mér eingi forvitni,” segir hann. “Ekki er mér svá gefit,” segir Sigmundur, “ok þangat skal ek fara.” “Þú munt ráða hljóta,” segir þúrir, “en brjótum við þa boðorð föstra míns.” Nu fóru þeir, ok hafiði Sigmundur viðaröxi eina í hendi sér ; koma í skóginn, ok í rjóðr eitt fagurt ; ok er þeir hafa þar eigi leingi verit, þá heyra þeir björn mikinn harðla ok grimligan. Þat var viðbjörn mikill, úlfgrár at lit. Þeir hlaupa nu aptra á stiginn þan, er þeir höfðu þangat farit ; stigrinn, var mjór ok þraurigr, ok hleypr þórir fyrir, en Sigmundur stöðar. Dýrit hleypr nú optir þeim á stiginn, ok verðr því þraungr stigrinn, ok brotna eiknir fyrir því. Sigmundur snyr þá skjótt út af stignum millum trjánna, ok biðr þar til er dýrit kemr jafn-fran honum. Þa huggir hann jafnt meðal hlusta á dýrinu með treim höndum, svá et exin sökkr. En dýrit fellr áfram, ok er dautt.

FEROIC.

Nú vör so til ajna Ferina um Summari, at Sigmundur snakkaji so vi Towra : “Kvat man bagga, towat við färin uj henda Skowin, uj er hér noran-firi Gärin?” Towrur svärrar, “Ikkji hävi e Hu at forvitnast ettir tuj,” siir han. “Ikkji eri e so sintur,” siir Sigmundur, “og häar skäl e fara.” “Tú fert tá at ráa,” siir Towrur, “men tá brovum vid Forbo Fostirfäir mujns.” Nú fowru tajr, og Sigmundur heji ajna öksi til Brennuri uj Hondini ; tajr koma in uj Skowin, og á ayt vákurt rudda Plosmen ikkji häva tajr veri här lágngji, firin tajr hojra kvödt Brak uj Skownun, og brát ettir sujgja tajr ajna egvulia stowra Bjödn og gruiska. Tá vá ajn stowr Skowbjödn grágulmut á Litinun. Tuir lejpa nú attir á Räsina, sum tajr höddu gingji ettir ; Rásin vör mjáv og trong ; Towrur lejpur urdan, og Sigmundur attaná. Djowri leipur nú ettir tajmum á Rásini ; og nú verur Rásin trong kjá tuj, so at Ajkjinar brotnavu frá tuj. Sigmundur snujur tá kvikliani útáf Rásini inimidlum Trjini, og bujar här til Djowri kjemur abajnt han. Tá huggur han bajnt uj Ojrnalystri á Djowrinum vi hávun Hondun, so at öxin sökkr in, og Djowri dettir bajnt framettir, og er standejt.

Swedish.

Och nu var det engång om sommaren, som Sigmund sade till Thorér : “Hvad mände väl deraf warda, om vi åter gå ut i skogen, som ligger der norr om gården?” “Det är jag alldeles icke nyfiken att veta,” svarade Thor. “Icke går det så mid meg,” sade Sigmund, “och ditret måste jag.” Du kommer då att råda,” sade Thor, “men dermed öfverträda vi

tår Fosterfaders bud." De gingo nu åstad, och Sigmund hade en vedyxa i handen ; de kommo in i skogen, och strat derpå fingo de se en ganska stor och vildsinnt björn, en dråpelig skogsbjörn, varg-grå till färgen. De sprungo då tillbaka på samma stig som de hade kommit dit. Stigen var smal och trång ; och Thorer sprang främst, men Sigmund efterst. Djuret lopp nu efter dem på stigen, och stigen blef trång för detsamma, så att träden sänderbrötosi deas lopp. Sigmund vände då kurtigt retaf från stigen, och ställde sig mellan träden, samt stod der, tills djuret, kom fram midt för honom. Då fattade han yxan med begge händerna, och högg midt emellan öronen på djuret, så att yxan gick in, och djuret störtade framåt, och dog på stället.

Danish.

Og nu var det engang om Sommeren, at Sigmund sagde til Thorer : "Hvad mon der vel kan flyde af, om vi end gaae hen i den Skov, som ligger her nordenfor Gaarden?" "Det er jeg ikken nysgjerrig efter at vide," svarede Thorer. "Ei gaar det mig saa," sagde Sigmund, "og derud maa jeg." "Du kommer da til at raade," sagde Thorer, "men da overtræde, vi vor Fosterfaders Bud." De gik nu, og Sigmund havde en Vedøxe i Haanden ; de kom ind i Skoven, og strax derpaa saae de en meget stor og grum Björn, en drabelig Skovejörn, ulvegaa af Farve. De løb da tilbage ad den samme Sti, ad hvilken de vare komne derhen. Stien var smal og trang ; og Thorer løb forrest, men Sigmund bagerst. Dyret løb nu efter dem paa Stien, og Stien blev trang for det, og Træerne brodes i dets. Løb Sigmund dreiede da nu hurtig ud af Stien, og stillede sig imellem Træerne, og stod der indtil Dyret, kom frem lige for ham. Da fattede han øxen med Begge Hænder, og hug lige imellem ørerne paa Dyret, saa at øxen sank i, og Dyret styrtede fremad, og var død paa Stedet.

English.

And now is it a time about the summer, that Sigmund spake to Thorir : "What would become, even if we two go into the shaw (*wood*), which here is north from the house?" Thorir answers, "Thereto there is to me no curiosity," says he. "So is it not with me," says Sigmund, "and thither shall I go." "Thou mayst counsel," says Thorir, "but we two break the bidding-word of foster-father mine." Now go they, and Sigmund had a wood-axe in his hands ; they come into the wood, and into a fair place ; and as they had not been there long, they hear a bear, big, fierce, and grim. It was a wood-bear, big, wolf-grey in hue. They run (leap) now back (after) to the path, by which they had gone thither. The path was narrow and strait ; and Thorir runs first, and Sigmund after. The beast runs now after them on the path, and the path becomes strait, and broken oaks before it. Sigmund turns then short out of the path among the trees, and bides there till the beast comes even with him. Then cuts he even in between the ears of the beast with his two hands, so that the axe sinks, and the beast falls forwards, and is dead.

(2.)

From the Edda.

Upp reis 'Oðinn
 alda gautr,
 ok hann á Sleipni
 sötul um lagði ;
 reið hann niðr ðaðan
 Nifheljar til,
 mætti hann hvelpi
 þeim er or helju kom.

Sá var blóðugr
 um brjóst framan,
 ok galdrs föður
 gól um lengi.
 Framm reið Oðinn.
 foldvegr dundi,
 hann kom at háfu
 Heljar ranni.

In English.

Up rose Odin,
 Of men king ;
 Eke he on Sleipner
 Saddle on-laid.
 Rode he nether-wards thence
 Nifhel til ;
 Met he the whelp ;
 Which out of hell came.

He was bloody
 On breast in front ;
 Eke at the spell's father
 Barked long.
 Forward rode Odin
 The fieldway dinned :
 He came at the high
 Hell's house.

§ 92. It is not difficult to arrange the above-named languages systematically: the Moeso-Gothic, the High-German, the Low-German, the Old Saxon, the Anglo-Saxon, and the Frisian, being called *Teutonic* rather than Scandinavian; the Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Feroic, and Icelandic being called *Scandinavian* rather than Teutonic. In other words, the great German class falls into two branches, a southern branch for Germany Proper, and a northern branch for Denmark and the parts beyond the Baltic.

 CHAPTER XVI.

EXTINCTION OF CERTAIN FORMS OF SPEECH IN GERMANY.

—SPREAD OF THE LOW—OF THE HIGH-GERMAN.

§ 93. At the present moment there is nothing throughout the whole length and breadth of Germany but the High-German, the Low-German, and the Frisian; the Low-German including the Dutch of Holland. Of the Angle

and the Old Saxon, nothing remains. The Frisian represents the class they belong to ; but the Frisian itself is a fragment. The Mæso-Gothic, like the Angle and the Old Saxon, is also extinct ; indeed its exact locality is a point upon which there is more than one doctrine : though, as a general rule, opinion is in favour of Thuringia.

So much, then, for the languages which have disappeared, and so much for the Frisian, which is in a fair way of disappearing. The forms of speech which have supplanted them are the High-German and the Low-German—the German of the South and East and the German of the North. Allied in structure, they have developed themselves differently. It was the Low-German which spread itself at the expense of the Angle and Old Saxon ; and these it appears to have replaced before the High-German came into the field. Its encroachments began under Charlemagne ; when the Old Saxon first, and afterwards the Anglo-Saxon, gave way to it. It was partially arrested by the marshes of Friesland, and partially, on the borders of Denmark, by the Eyder. Sleswick, however, though now half German, was originally wholly Danish ; so that it is the Low-German which has most especially encroached on the Scandinavian. It is the Low-German also which has encroached upon the Slavonic of Luneburg, Lauenburg, Eastern Holstein, Altmark, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and Brandenburg. It is the Low-German which, protruding itself beyond the boundaries of Slavonia, has most especially encroached upon the Lithuanian of Prussia, of Courland, and of Livonia. Finally, it is the Low-German which has encroached upon the Fin or Ugrian, of Esthonia. For all this, however, it is not the literary language of Germany, though it is that of Holland. Elsewhere, notwithstanding the existence of several notable compositions in it, it passes for a provincial form of speech. At what time it completed the displacement of the Angle of Germany is uncertain.

Mutatis mutandis the material history of the High-German is nearly that of the Low. The former extended itself in the south as the latter extended itself in the north. So far as Switzerland is German, it is *High-German*; so are the dialects of the Tyrol and the Italian frontier, so also the German of Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, where it comes in contact with the Slavonic; so is the German of Hungary, Bohemia, Saxony, Bavaria, Swabia, and Franconia. The importance, however, of the High-German form of speech by no means consists in the magnitude of its area; but rather in the fact of its being the language in which the literature of Germany is embodied. It was cultivated betimes, and it was cultivated successfully. The Reformation determined its ascendancy. Whilst the Protestant portion of the empire lay almost wholly within the limits of Low Germany, the language of Luther was the High-German of Saxony; and it was the High-German of Saxony into which the standard translation of the Holy Scriptures was made. Hence it became the language of the Church and the Schools; and that in the extreme Low-German districts—the districts which were most especially Protestant. Of the standard literature, then, which has been developed since the Reformation, the Low-German dialects of Germany supply little or nothing. The Dutch of *Holland* (as has been stated) is a cultivated language: and in Holland only is the Low-German form of speech the vehicle of a national literature.

The Low-German—propagated by the Carlovingian Franks—encroached upon the Angle, the Old Saxon, the Frisian, and the Danish. The High-German of the Reformers has encroached, and is encroaching, upon the Low.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE KELTIC CLASS.

§ 94. THE original British was akin to the present Welsh. So was the Cornish. So, also, was the Armorican of Brittany.

<i>English.</i>	<i>Welsh.</i>	<i>Cornish.</i>	<i>Breton.</i>
<i>Head</i>	Pen.	Pen.	Penn.
<i>Hair</i>	Gwallt.	Bleu.	Bleo.
<i>Eye</i>	Llygad.	Lagat.	Lagad.
<i>Nose</i>	Trwyn.	Tenn.	Fry.
<i>Mouth</i>	Ceg.	Genau.	Guenon.
<i>Teeth</i>	Dannodd.	Dyns.	Dant.
<i>Tongue</i>	Tafod.	Tavat.	Teod.
<i>Ear</i>	Clust.	Scovorn.	Scouarn.
<i>Back</i>	Cefn.	Chein.	Chein.
<i>Blood</i>	Gwaed.	Guit.	Goad.
<i>Arm</i>	Braich.	Brech.	Brech.
<i>Hand</i>	Llaw.	Lof.	Dourn.
<i>Leg</i>	Coes.	Coes.	Garr.
<i>Foot</i>	Troed.	Truit.	Troad.
<i>Nail</i>	Ewin.	Ivin.	Ivin.
<i>Horse</i>	Ceffyl.	March.	March.
<i>Cow</i>	Buwch.	Bugh.	Vioch.
<i>Calf</i>	Llo.	Loch.	Leue.
<i>Sheep</i>	Dafad.	Davat.	Danvat.
<i>Lamb</i>	Oen.	Oin.	Oan.
<i>Goat</i>	Gafr.	Gavar.	Chaour.
<i>Dog</i>	Ci.	Ky.	Chy.
<i>Fox</i>	Llwynog.	Louvern.	Louarn.
<i>Goose</i>	Gwydd.	Guit.	Oaz.
<i>Crow</i>	Brân.	Bran.	Vran.
<i>Bird</i>	Adar.	Ezn.	Ein.
<i>Fish</i>	Pysg.	Pysg.	Pysg.
<i>One</i>	Un.	Onan.	Unan.
<i>Two</i>	Dau.	Deu.	Daou.
<i>Three</i>	Tri.	Try.	Tri.
<i>Four</i>	Pedwar.	Peswar.	Pevar.
<i>Five</i>	Pump.	Pypm.	Pemp.
<i>Six</i>	Chwech.	Whe.	Chuech.
<i>Seven</i>	Saith.	Seyth.	Seiz.

<i>English.</i>	<i>Welsh.</i>	<i>Cornish.</i>	<i>Breton</i>
<i>Eight</i>	Wyth.	Eath.	Eiz.
<i>Nine</i>	Naw.	Naw.	Nao.
<i>Ten</i>	Deg.	Dek.	Dec.
<i>Twenty</i>	Ugain	Ugenis.	Ugent.
<i>Hundred</i>	Cant.	Cant.	Cant.

§ 95. Again—the Gaelic of Ireland, the Gaelic of Scotland, and the Manks of the Isle of Man, are all closely related to each other, and somewhat more remotely to the Welsh, Cornish, and Breton.

<i>English.</i>	<i>Irish.</i>	<i>Scotch.</i>	<i>Manks.</i>
<i>Head</i>	Cean. ^{ca}	Ceann.	Kione.
<i>Hair</i>	Folt.	Folt.	Folt.
<i>Eye</i>	Sùil.	Sùil.	Sooil.
<i>Nose</i>	Sron.	Sròin.	Stroin.
<i>Mouth</i>	Beul.	Beul.	Beéal.
<i>Tooth</i>	Fiacail.	Fiacal.	Feeackle.
<i>Tongue</i>	Teanga.	Teanga.	Chengcy.
<i>Ear</i>	Duas.	Duas.	Cleaysh.
<i>Back</i>	Druim.	Druim.	Dreem.
<i>Blood</i>	Fuil.	Fuil.	Fuill.
<i>Arm</i>	Gairdean.	Gairdean.	Clingan.
<i>Hand</i>	Lamh.	Lamh.	Lave.
<i>Leg</i>	Cos.	Cos.	Cass.
<i>Nail</i>	Iongna.	Iongna.	Ingin.
<i>Horse</i>	Each.	Each.	Agh.
<i>Cow</i>	Bo.	Bo.	Booa.
<i>Calf</i>	Laogh.	Laogh.	Lheiy.
<i>Sheep</i>	Caor.	Caor.	Keyrrey.
<i>Lamb</i>	Uan.	Uan.	Eayn.
<i>Goat</i>	Gabhair.	Gabhar.	Goayr.
<i>Dog</i>	Cu.	Cu.	Coo.
<i>Fox</i>	Sionnach.	Sionnach.	Shynnagh.
	Geodh.	Geodh.	Guiy.
<i>Crow</i>	Feannog.	Feannag.	Feeagh.
<i>Bird.</i>	Ban.	Eun.	Ean.
<i>Fish</i>	Iasg.	Iasg.	Eeast.
<i>One</i>	Aon.	Aon.	Unnane.
<i>Two</i>	Do.	Dhà.	Dhaa.
<i>Three</i>	Tri.	Tri.	Tree.
<i>Four</i>	Ceathar.	Ceithin.	Kiare.
<i>Five</i>	Cùig.	Cuig.	Queig.
<i>Six</i>	Sè.	Se.	Shey.

<i>English.</i>	<i>Irish.</i>	<i>Scotch.</i>	<i>Manks</i>
<i>Seven</i>	Seacht.	Seachd.	Shiaght.
<i>Eight</i>	Ocht.	Ochd.	Hoght.
<i>Nine</i>	Naoi.	Naoi.	Nuy.
<i>Ten</i>	Deich.	Deig.	• Jelh.
<i>Twenty</i>	Fithe.	Fichead.	Feed.
<i>Hundred</i>	Cead.	Ceud.	Keead.

§ 96. The class to which all these forms of speech belong is the Keltic; of which the Welsh, Cornish, and Breton form the *British*, the Irish, the Scotch, and the Manks the *Gaelic*, branch.

CHAPTER XVIII.

LANGUAGES AKIN TO THE LATIN AND GREEK.

§ 97. THE languages of Greece and Rome belong to one and the same stock; of which the Greek with its dialects, both ancient and modern, constitutes one branch, the Latin with its dialects, another.

Now, although the Greek dialects are of only secondary importance in the illustration of the history of the English language, the *Latin* elements require a special consideration.

This is because the Norman-French, introduced into England by the battle of Hastings, is a language derived from the Latin.

From Italy, its original seat, the Latin was extended—

1. To the Spanish peninsula.
2. To Gaul.
3. To Dacia, *i. e.* the Danubian Principalities.
4. To parts of Switzerland.

From these different introductions of the Latin into different countries, we have the following modern languages—1st, Italian; 2nd, Spanish and Portuguese; 3rd,

French ; 4th, Wallachian ; 5th, the Romanese of part of the Grisons.

§ 98. *The Norman-French*.—The North-western form of the French language in Normandy, Picardy, &c., is called *Norman-French*. The Battle of Hastings introduced it into England.

SPECIMEN.

FROM THE ANGLO-NORMAN POEM OF "CHARLEMAGNE."

Un jur fu Karléun al Seint-Denis muster,
Reout prise sa corune, en croiz, seignat sun chef,
E ad ceinte sa espée : li pons fud d'or mer.
Dux i out e demeines e baruns e chevalers.
Li emperères reguardet la reine sa muillers.
Ele fut ben coronée al plus bel e as meuz.

Translation, Literal.

One day was Charlemagne at St. Denis' minster,
Had taken his crown, in-cross marked (*signed*) his head,
And had girt his sword; the hilt was of gold pure (*mere*),
Dukes there he had, and lords (*domines*, or *dons*) and barons and cavaliers.
The emperor looked-at (*regarded*) the queen his wife ;
She was well crowned, at the most beautiful and at the best.

Latin.

Unum diurnum fuit Carolus, ad illud Sancti Dionysii monasterium,
Re-habebat prehensam suam coronam, in cruce signatum suum caput,
Et habebat cinctam suam spadam; ille pugnus fuit de auro mero,
Duces ibi habebat, et dominos, et barones, et caballarios.
Ille imperator contemplatus est illam reginam suam mulierem;
Illa fuit bene coronata ad plus bellum et ad melius.

The Norman-French is also called the Anglo-Norman.

CHAPTER XIX.

SYSTEMATIC VIEW OF THE CLASS TO WHICH THE ENGLISH
AND THE GERMAN LANGUAGES IN GENERAL BELONG.

§ 99. THE relations of the English to the Anglo-Saxon have been considered. So have those of the Anglo-Saxon

with the other languages of Germany,—the result being a group, stock, or class, named *German*.

A similar classification of the British and Gaelic gave us a similar group—a group named *Keltic*.

A third led us to the Latin and the Greek tongues. That these are members of one and the same group is well known, though the exact measure of their relationship has yet to be taken. In all probability we shall never get more than an approximation. However, the current doctrine is, that the two branches are less alike than the Scandinavian and the Teutonic; more alike than the British and Erse. For the group at large an unexceptionable name is still wanted. The present writer generally calls it *Classical*; others name it *Thracian*; others *Pelasgic*. Each of these latter terms involves a very doubtful hypothesis.

But these three groups are members of a larger class. Neither are they the only members. Before we get the *whole* of the system to which the English belongs, we must turn our eyes eastwards, and consider three fresh groups—the Slavonic, the Lithuanic, and the Sanskrit. It is not requisite to consider them very fully. It is only necessary to know that, whether treated separately, or subordinated to some higher class, they are the complement to the groups just enumerated. In other words, the Sanskrit, the Lithuanic, the Slavonic, the Latin and Greek, the German and the Keltic, form one great class—a class which is generally called *Indo-European*.

§ 100. *The Slavonic*.—The numerous dialects of the Slavonic are most conveniently arranged round the following languages:—(1) The Polish; (2) the Bohemian; (3) the Servian; (4) the Russian; (5) the Bulgarian.

(1.) To the Polish belong the dialects of the kingdom of Poland itself, the Grand Duchy of Posen, and Galicia. To the Polish, too, in all probability, belonged most of the dialects of that part of Germany which was

originally Slavonic, especially those of Pomerania, Altmark, and Lüneburg. This is an inference from such fragments of them as either now exist, or have existed within the period of authentic history. Such is the Kassub, or Kassubic, of the Slavonians of the Rugenwalde, the remnants of the original Pomeranians. Such was the language of the Slavonians of Lüneburg, of which we have a sample, a Paternoster of the last century, strangely compounded of Slavonic and German. Such, too, (unless we place it in a class by itself,) is the Serb of Lusatia, the representative of the old Slavonic of Saxony.

(2.) The Czek, or Tshek, is the language of Bohemia and Moravia. The Slovak of the northern part of Hungary is, perhaps, more Czek than aught else: though it is, by no means, certain that (like the Lusatian) it may not, without inconvenience, be placed in a group by itself.

(3.) Round the Servian of Servia we may group the several dialects of southern Hungary, Croatia, Carinthia, Carniola, Dalmatia, Bosnia, and Montenegro.*

(4.) The Russian falls into the Little Russian of Buchovina and the Ukraine; the White Russian of Smolensko; and the Russian of the empire in general.

(5.) The Bulgarian is spoken in Bulgaria and in parts of Wallachia, Moldavia, and Macedonia.

(6.) To these add the Old Slavonic of the earliest Slave literature. The exact dialect which this represents is uncertain. It is only certain that it belongs to the East rather than the West—being Servian, Russian, or Bulgarian, rather than either Polish or Bohemian.

§ 101. *The Lithuanic*.—Originally, the Lithuanic was the language of East Prussia. Originally, too, it was the chief language of Courland, as well as of the Governments of Wilna, and Grodno. At present it is limited to those parts of Prussia which lie nearest to Courland, and to Lithuania. In Lithuania it is found in certain districts

only. Its eastern boundary is (there or thereabouts) the river Salis in Livonia, where it is succeeded by the Fin, or Ugrian, of Estonia. In Courland and Livonia it is known as the *Lett*; in Prussia as the, *High*, in Grodno and Vilna as the *Low*, *Lithuanic*.

§ 102. *The Sanskrit*.—One of the languages of the arrow-headed inscriptions, along with its congeners, the Zend, is closely allied to the ancient literary language of India, the Sanskrit; the nearest affinities of the Sanskrit being with the languages of Europe; especially the Lithuanic and the Old Slavonic.

§ 103. This gives us a class of considerable range and magnitude; a class which comprises the Irish Gaelic on the west, and the Sanskrit on the east; the Norwegian on the north, and the Greek on the south. The exact value of the different divisions is doubtful; nor is it, for the present, of any great importance. For the present, it is enough to know that all the languages contained in the class under notice are not only capable of illustrating each other, but, often used to do so.

CHAPTER XX.

HISTORICAL AND LOGICAL ELEMENTS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—LANGUAGES ANTERIOR TO, AND LANGUAGES SUBSEQUENT TO, THE ANGLO-SAXON.—THE KELTIC ELEMENTS.—THE LATIN OF THE FIRST PERIOD.—THE LEGIONARY.—THE LATIN OF THE SECOND.—THE DANISH.—THE ANGLO-NORMAN.—THE LATIN OF THE THIRD PERIOD.—OF THE FOURTH.—GREEK.—MISCELLANEOUS ELEMENTS.

§ 104. THE elements out of which the language of England has been formed are—

(a.) Elements referable to the original British popu-

lation, and derived from times *anterior* to the Angle invasion.

(b.) Angle elements.

(c.) Elements other than Angle, introduced *since* the Anglo-Saxon conquest.

§ 105. Of the elements *anterior* to the Angle invasion, the chief are:—

(a.) The Keltic, or British.

(b.) The Latin of the Roman, or first, period.

(c.) The Legionary (?).

The Keltic elements of the present English fall into the following classes.

1. Those that are of late introduction, and cannot be called original and constituent parts of the language. Some of such are the words *flannel*, from the Cambrian, and *kerne* (an Irish foot-soldier), *galore* (enough), *tartan*, *plaid*, &c., from the Gaelic branch. Some of these are scarcely incorporated.

2. Those that were originally common to both the Keltic and Gothic stocks. Some of such are *brother*, *mother*, in Keltic *brathair*, *mathair*; the numerals, &c.

3. Those that have come to us from the Keltic, but have come to us through the medium of another language. Some of such are *druid* and *bard*; the *immediate* source of which is, not the Keltic but, the Latin.

4. Keltic elements of the Anglo-Norman, introduced into England after the Conquest, and occurring in that language as remains of the original Keltic of Gaul.

5. Those that have been retained from the original Keltic of the island and which form genuine constituents of our language. These fall into five subdivisions.

(a.) Proper names—generally of geographical localities; as *the Thames*, *Kent*, &c.

(b.) Common names retained in the provincial dialects of England, but not retained in the current language;

as *gwethall* = *household stuff*, and *gwlanen* = *flannel* in Herefordshire.

(c.) Vulgarisms and slang expressions differing from the words of the preceding class by being used over the whole of England—*game*, as in *game (crooked) leg*—(see below *kam*)—*bam* (*mystify*), *spree*, *tantrum*.

(d.) Words used by the earlier, but not by the later writers.

Kam.—In Coriolanus we find *This is clean kam*;—*kam* meaning *crooked, awry*. In Lancashire* to *cam* means to *bend*. The river *Cam*, though between *Cam* bridge and Ely it is one of the straightest rivers in England, between Grantchester and Cambridge is one of the most winding. David *Gám*, the valiant Welshman who saved Henry the Fifth's life at Agincourt, was, probably, *Crooked David*.

Kendel, as in a *kendel of cats*.—Welsh *cededl*=family: *cedellu*=to *conceive*: from which we have the verb *kindle*.

Imp.—Welsh *ympiaw*=*engraft*. Used in falconry for supplying a lost wing-feather.

Crowd, crowder=*fiddle, fiddler*.—In Hudibras *Crowdero* is a proper name. In Venantius Fortunatus we find the words *crutta Britanna*. Word for word this is *cithara*.*

Capull, in *capul-hyde*=*horse-hide*.—Welsh *cefyll*, Irish *capul*. Word for word, this is the Latin *caballus*.*

(e.) Common names current in the present language—*basket, balderdash, boggle, barrow, button, bother, bran, cart, clout, coat, dainty, darn, fag* (as in *fag-end*), *fleam* (*cattle lancet*), *flaw, funnel, gyve* (*fetter*), *grid* (in *grid-iron*), *gruel, gown, gusset, hopper* (in a mill), *kiln, mattock, mop, pelt, rail, rasher* (of bacon), *rug, solder* (or

* These two words seem to have come *through* the Keltic rather than *from* it.

sawder, in metal work), *size* (*glue*), *ted* (as hay), *tenter* (in *tenter-hook*), *welt*, *wicket*, *wire*.

This list, taken chiefly from Messrs. Garnett and Davies, may be enlarged—though not (I believe) to any great extent.

§ 106. *The Latin of the Roman Period*.—Of the Latin of the first period we have but few instances; these being chiefly geographical names. Thus:—

Speenham, in Oxfordshire = *Spinæ*.

Devizes = *Devisæ*.

The *-coln*, in words like *Lin-corn*, = *colonia* = *Lindi colonia*.—The rivers and brooks named *coln* are (*perhaps*) the rivers or brooks of the *colonia*—*Coln-brooke*, the *Colne*, &c.

The forms *-chester*, *-cester*, *kester-*, and *-caster*, as in *Dor-chester*, *Ciren-cester*, *Kester-ton*, and *An-caster* = the Latin *castra*.

The several places named *Wath*, are (*perhaps*) the Latin *vadum* of this period.

The several places beginning with *Pon*—e. g. *Pon-ton*. are (*perhaps*) the Latin *pons* of this period

The several *Creakes* and *Cricks* are (*perhaps*) the immediately Latin, but more remotely Greek, *κυρίακη* = *church*. If so, they belong to the period of the British Church.

Crouch, as in *Crouch-end* = *cruz*. It is doubtful, however, whether the name goes back to the time of the British Church, the only one which could give us the Latin of the first period.

The *Watling-street* is (*perhaps*) *Via Vitaliana*. At any rate there is an inscription bearing the name of an engineer named *Vitalius*.

The numerous *Cold Harbours* are all said to be on Roman roads, and it has been surmised that the origin of the first word may be the Latin *calidus* = *warm*.

Street, whether as *Strat-ford*, as *Stret-ton*, or simply as *Street* (as in *Chester-le-Street*), is the Latin *strata*. Wherever it occurs it is, at least, *primâ facie* evidence of a Roman road; and may be used as an instrument of criticism, the ascertaining their lines.

Wall is (*probably*) *vallum*. At any rate, the Picts of Beda's time spoke of the *Peann Fahel* as *Caput Valli* = *the Head of the Wall*.

Whether the list is to be increased or diminished, one fact is clear: viz. that the Latin of the Roman, Keltic, or first period, consists, chiefly, of geographical terms. In other words, it contains *proper*, rather than *common*, names.

§ 107. The *Legionary*.—It has already been stated that all the Roman soldiers were not Romans. Traces of their languages have yet to be found. The likeliest line for them is that of the *Wall* between the Tyne and Solway.

§ 108. The *Latin of the Second, or Angle Period*.—The Latin of the Anglo-Saxon period was that of the ecclesiastic, rather than the classical, period. Many of the words belonging to it were barbarous. Books, too, being rare, the lessons were given by word of mouth. The extent to which the language thus taught was cultivated is uncertain. The following is a well-known extract from King Alfred's Preface to his Translation of Gregory's *Pastorale*:—

"So cleaen was it lost amongst the men of England, that there were very few on this" (the south) "side of the Humber who could understand their service in English" (i. e. know what the Latin meant), "or translate an epistle from the Latin into the English. And I ween that, beyond the Humber, there were not many. So few were they, that I cannot think of any to the south of Thames, when I began to reign. Thank God that now we have a few teachers."

It seems from the word *lost* (*oðfeallen*) that there had been more Latin in the days before Alfred than there was

under him ; and when we consider that the eighth century was the era of Beda this seems probable.

§ 109. The following words are referable to this period, *i. e.* they were introduced between A.D. 600 and the battle of Hastings. They relate, chiefly, to ecclesiastical matters. The names of plants (chiefly medicinal, or believed to be so) are also numerous.

<i>Anglo-Saxon.</i>	<i>English.</i>	<i>Latin.</i>
<i>Mynster</i>	minster	monasterium.
<i>Tempel</i>	temple	templum.
<i>Chor</i>	choir	chorus.
<i>Cyrcce</i>	church	εκκλησία.
<i>Portic</i>	porch	porticus.
<i>Cluster</i>	cloister	claustrum.
<i>Munuc</i>	monk	monachus.
<i>Biscep</i>	bishop	episcopus.
<i>Archbiscep</i>	archbishop	archiepiscopus.
<i>Diacon</i>	deacon	diaconus.
<i>Nunne</i>	nun	nonna.
<i>Sanct</i>	saint	sanctus.
<i>Profost</i>	provost	præpositus.
<i>Preost</i>	priest	presbyter.
<i>Measse</i>	mass	missa.
<i>Sacerd</i>	—	sacerdos.
<i>Albe</i>	aube	alba.
<i>Pall</i>	pall	pallium.
<i>Calic</i>	chalice	calix.
<i>Candel</i>	candle	candela.
<i>Psalter</i>	psalter	psalterium.
<i>Pistel</i>	epistle	epistola.
<i>Prædician</i>	preach	prædicare.
<i>Profian</i>	prove	probare.
<i>Tunic</i>	tunic	tunica.
<i>Scrin</i>	—	scrinium.
<i>Cæsere (Emperor)</i>	—	Cæsar.
<i>Lilie</i>	lily	lilium.
<i>Rose</i>	rose	rosa.
<i>Fynel</i>	fennel	feniculum.
<i>Næpte</i>	—	nepeta.
<i>Lufuste</i>	lovage	ligusticum.
<i>Fejerfuge</i>	feverfew	febrifuga.
<i>Rute</i>	rue	ruta.

<i>Anglo-Saxon.</i>	<i>English.</i>	<i>Latin.</i>
<i>Mint</i>	mint	mentha.
<i>Radice</i>	radish	radix.
<i>Næpe</i>	navew (<i>turnip</i>)	napus.
<i>Senep</i>	—	sinapi.
<i>Cærfille</i>	chervill	cerefolium.
<i>Peterselige</i>	parsley-piert	petroselinum.
<i>Pervince</i>	periwinkle	vinca.
<i>Pionie</i>	peony	pæonia.
<i>Lactuce</i>	lettuce	lactuca.
<i>Fic-beam</i>	fig-tree	figus.
<i>Magdala-treow</i>	almond-tree	amygdalum.
<i>Pin-treow</i>	pine-tree	pinus.
<i>Cederbeam</i>	cedar-beam	cedrus.
<i>Hyssop</i>	hyssop	hyssopus.
<i>Balsalm</i>	*balsam	balsamum.
<i>Cumedris</i>	germander	chamædrys.
<i>Fille</i>	—	serpillum.
<i>Salrige</i>	sage	salvia.
<i>Ancer</i>	anchor	anchora.
<i>Must</i>	—	mustum.
<i>Pumicstan</i>	pumice-stone	pumex.
<i>Arcu</i>	bow	arcus.

§ 110. *Danish Elements.*—Respecting the Danish element in the English there are several extreme *statements* afloat. Whether the *opinions*, when analyzed, exactly bear them out, is another question. There is a statement that the pure Anglo-Saxon language was not influenced by them at all; and this, if it mean the West-Saxon, is true. There is also the statement, that no traces of Danish are to be found in our manuscripts: which, if it mean that there was nothing more than a Danish word here and there, is also true. There is also a statement that there is no trace of Danish to be found in our dialects; which is exceptionable. There *are* Danish words in our dialects. There *are* Danish words in such manuscripts as belong to the Danish parts of England; but in these manuscripts there are no traces of any Danish orthography, nor in the dialects are there any Danish

inflections; marked in their character as those inflections are. The Danish words themselves, even when the utmost latitude is allowed, are not numerous; or they are only numerous in the eyes of those who would say that the Arabic words in English form a notable and constituent part of our language. The evidence, however, of their being Danish at all is unsatisfactory. It is an easy matter to find an English word in a Danish dictionary. It is not very difficult to prove its absence in an Anglo-Saxon one. To show that it is not Frisian or Old Saxon is not so easy. To show that it is absent in the provincial dialects of Holstein, Hanover, and Westphalia, is difficult. Yet until all this be done the Norse must not be resorted to. Laying aside then the Lowland Scotch, in which the Norse element is undoubted; laying aside the provincial dialects of England, in which Norse words are to be found; laying aside the early compositions, which are more or less provincial, we come to the question—What is the amount of the Danish words in the *present English, as written and spoken*? It is small: and it must be admitted that it is smaller than the current views respecting the Danish invasions, and the general analogies of history, at the first view induce us to expect. But analogy or presumption is one thing, numerical results another. What is the amount of Danish words in the present English? A list of Mr. Coleridge's, than whom no one has given a longer one, includes all the three classes alluded to,—the provincialisms, the words found in compositions belonging to the Danish districts (in reality a division of the former group), and the integral portions of the current English. The latter come under the conditions of being found in the Norse and not being found in the Anglo-Saxon dictionaries. They also seem absent in the ordinary Frisian vocabularies. Out of this list, those portions of the current English which the

present writer cannot at once pronounce to be other than Norse, are the following :—

<i>Bait</i>	<i>Dock</i>	<i>Fling</i>	<i>Rap</i>
<i>Bray</i>	<i>Doze</i>	<i>Gust</i>	<i>Slant</i>
<i>Bustle</i>	<i>Drub</i>	<i>Hank</i>	<i>Sly</i> [eyed]
<i>Chime</i>	<i>Dwell</i>	<i>Ill</i>	<i>Wall</i> (in wall-)
<i>Dash</i>	<i>Flimsy</i>	<i>Ransack</i>	<i>Whim</i>

Upon the real or supposed special influence of the Danish upon the Northumbrian dialects more is said elsewhere.

§ 111. *The Anglo-Norman Elements*.—These are, to a great extent, words connected with the feudal system, war, chivalry, and the refinements of social life. Words like *duke*, *count*, *baron*, *villain*, *esquire*, *warrant*, *challenge*, *domain*, &c., belong to this class. The well-known dialogue between Gurth and Wamba, in *Ivanhoe*, upon the words *beef*, *veal*, *mutton*, and *pork*, as contrasted with *ox*, *calf*, *sheep*, and *swine*, the former of which are Anglo-Norman, the latter English, tells us that, whilst the animal in its natural state bore the name given it by the conquered natives, the cooked viand took its name from the language of the conquerors.

The rate at which the Anglo-Norman elements were introduced is doubtful. They are numerous in Chaucer and Gower: less numerous in Wicliffe. In Layamon's long poem, the *Brut*, the following are, according to Sir F. Madden, all that are to be found :—

<i>Modern.</i>	<i>Layamon.</i>	<i>Modern.</i>	<i>Layamon.</i>
Admiral	admirail	Country	contre
Abbey	abbey	Cry	cri
Astronomy	astronomie	Delay	delaie
Annoyed	anued	Failed	failede
Attire	atyre	Fool	fol
Baron	barun	Folly	folie
Crown	corune	False	falsie
Changed	changede	Guile	gile
Chapel	chapel	Grace	grace
Counsel	conseil	Grante	granti

<i>Modern.</i>	<i>Layamon.</i>	<i>Modern.</i>	<i>Layamon.</i>
Guise	guyse	Power	pouere
Honour	honur	Procession	processioun
Hostage	hostage	Peace	pais
Latimer	latinier	Park	parc
Machine	machunes	Prison	prisune
Manne	manere	Route	route
Maler	male	Service	sarevi
Mountainn	mountaine	Treasure	tresur

§ 112. *Latin of the Third Period.*—This means the Latin which was introduced between the battle of Hastings and the revival of literature. It chiefly originated in the cloister, in the universities, and, to a certain extent, in the courts of law.

§ 113. *Latin of the Fourth Period.*—This means the Latin which has been introduced between the revival of literature and the present time. It has originated in the writings of learned men in general, and often exhibits the phenomenon of imperfect incorporation; *i. e.* it supplies us with words which are only partially English.

Imperfect incorporation—

1. Has a direct ratio to the date of introduction, *i. e.* the more recent the word the more likely it is to retain its original inflection.

2. It has a relation to the number of meanings belonging to the words: thus, when a single word has two meanings, the original inflection expresses one, the English inflection another—*genius, genii (spirits), geniuses (men of genius)*.

3. It occurs with substantives only, and that only in the expression of number. Thus, although the plurals of substantives like *axis* and *genius* are Latin, the possessive cases are English. So also are the degrees of comparison for adjectives, and the tenses, &c., for verbs.

§ 114. The chief *Latin* substantives introduced during the latter part of the fourth period, and preserving the *Latin* plural forms, are—

(1.)

Words wherein the Latin plural is the same as the Latin singular.

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing. °</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Apparatus	apparatus	Congeries	congeries
Hiatus	hiatus	Series	series
Impetus	impetus	Species	species
Caries	caries	Superficies	superficies

(2.)

Words wherein the Latin plural is formed from the Latin singular by changing the last syllable.

(a.)—Where the singular termination *-a* is changed in the plural into *-æ* :—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Formula	formulæ	Larva	larvæ
Lamina	laminæ	Nebula	nebulæ

(b.)—Where the singular termination *-us* is changed in the plural into *-i* :—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Calculus	calculi	Polypus	polypi
Colossus	colossi	Radius	radii
Convolvulus	convolvuli	Ranunculus	ranunculi
Focus	foci	Sarcophagus	sarcophagi
Genius	genii	Scirrhus	scirrhi
Magus	magi	Stimulus	stimuli
Cæphagus	cæphagi	Tumulus	tumuli

(c.)—Where the singular termination *-um* is changed in the plural into *-a* :—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Arcanum	arcana	Mausoleum	mausolea
Collyrium	collyria	Medium	media
Datum	data	Memorandum	memoranda
Desideratum	desiderata	Menstruum	menstrua
Effluvium	effluvia	Momentum	momenta
Emporium	emporia	Premium	premia
Encomium	encomia	Scholium	scholia
Erratum	errata	Spectrum	spectra
Gymnasium	gymnasia	Speculum	specula
Lixivium	lixivia	Stratum	strata
Lustrum	lustra	Succedaneum	succedanea

(d.)—Where the singular termination *-is* is changed in the plural into *-es* :—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Amanuensis	amanuenses	Ellipsis	ellipses
Analysis	analyses	Emphasis	emphases
Antithesis	antitheses	Hypothesis	hypotheses
Axis	axes	Oasis	oases
Basis	bases	Parenthesis	parentheses
Crisis	crises	Synthesis	syntheses
Diæresis	diæreses	Thesis	theses

(3.)

Words wherein the plural is formed by inserting *-e* between the last two *sounds* of the singular, so that the former number always contains a syllable more than the latter :—

<i>Sing.</i>			<i>Plur.</i>
Apex	sounded	apex-s	apices
Appendix	—	appendic-s	appendices
Calyx	—	calic-s	calyces
Cicatrix	—	cicatric-s	cicatrices
Helix	—	helic-s	helices
Index	—	indic-s	indices
Radix	—	radic-s	radices
Vertex	—	vertic-s	vertices
Vortex	—	vortic-s	vortices

In all these words the *c* of the singular number is sounded as *k*, of the plural as *s*.

§ 115. The chief *Greek* substantives lately introduced, and preserving the *Greek* plural forms are—

(1.)

Words where the singular termination *-on* is changed in the plural into *-a* :—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Aphelion	aphelia	Criterion	criteria
Perihelion	perihelia	Ephemeron	ephemera
Automaton	automata	Phænomenon	phænomena

(2.)

Words where the plural is formed from the root by

adding either *-es* or *-a*, but where the singular rejects the last letter of the root.

<i>Plurals in -es.</i>		
<i>Original root.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>
Apsid-	apsides	apsis
Cantharid-	cantharides	cantharis
Chrysalid-	chrysalides	chrysalis
Ephemerid-	ephemerides	ephemeris
Tripod-	tripodes	tripos
<i>Plurals in -a.</i>		
<i>Original root.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>
Dogmat-	dogmata	dogma
Lemmat-	lemmata	lemma
Miasmata-	miasmata	miasma.*

§ 116. *Miscellaneous elements.*—Of miscellaneous elements we have two sorts; those that are incorporated in our language, and are currently understood (*e. g.* the Spanish word *sherry*, the Arabic word *alkali*, and the Persian word *turban*), and those that, even amongst the educated, are considered strangers. Of this latter kind (amongst many others) are the Oriental words *hummum*, *kaftan*, *gyl*, &c.

Of the currently understood miscellaneous elements of the English language, the most important are from the French; some of which preserve the original plural forms, as *beau*, *beaux*, *billet-doux*.

Italian.—Some words of Italian origin do the same; as *virtuoso*, *virtuosi*.

Hebrew.—The two Hebrew words *cherub* and *seraph* do the same; the form *cherub-im*, and *seraph-im* being not only plurals, but Hebrew plurals.

Beyond the words derived from these five languages none form their plural other than after the English method, *i. e.* in *-s*—as *waltzes*, from the German word *waltz*.

* This list is taken from Smart's valuable and logical English Grammar.

§ 117. The extent to which a language, like the English, which, at one and the same time, requires names for many objects, comes in contact with the tongues of half the world, and has a great power of incorporating foreign elements, derives fresh words from varied sources, may be seen from the following incomplete notice of the languages, which have, in different degrees, supplied it with new terms. These are chiefly taken from a paper of Mr. Craufurd's on the subject.

Arabic.—Admiral, alchemist, alchemy, alcohol, alcove, alembic, algebra, alkali, assassin, &c.

Persian.—Turban, caravan, dervise, &c.

Turkish.—Coffee, bashaw, divan, scimitar, Janisary, &c.

Indian.—Calico, chintz, cowhage or cowitch, cowry, curry, lac, muslin, toddy, &c.

Chinese.—Tea, bohea, congou, hyson, soy, nankin, &c.

Malay.—Bantam (fowl), gamboge, rattan, sago, shaddock, &c.

Polynesian.—Taboo.

Siberian.—Mammoth; the bones of which are chiefly from the banks of the Lena. Originally Arabic—i. e. *Behemoth*.

North-American.—Squaw, wigwam, pemmican.

Peruvian.—Charki=prepared meat; whence jerked beef.

Caribbean.—Hammock.

§ 118. A distinction is now drawn between the *direct* and the *in-direct*, the latter leading to the *ultimate*, origin of words.

A word borrowed into the English from the French may have been borrowed into the French from the Latin, into the Latin from the Greek, into the Greek from the Persian, &c., and so on *ad infinitum*.

The ultimate known origin of many common words sometimes goes back to a great date, and points to extinct languages.

§ 119. Again, a word from a given language may be introduced by more lines than one; or it may be introduced twice over; once at an earlier, and again at a later period. In such a case its forms will, most probably, vary; and, what is more, its meaning as well. *Syrup*, *sherbet*, and *shrub*, are all originally from the *Arabic*, *srb*; but introduced differently, viz. the first through the Latin, the second through the Persian, and the third direct. *Minster*, introduced during the Anglo-Saxon, is contrasted with *monastery*, introduced during the Anglo-Norman, period. By the proper application of these processes, we account for words so different in their present form, yet so identical in origin, as *priest* and *presbyter*, *episcopal* and *bishop*, &c.

§ 120. *Words of foreign, simulating a vernacular, origin.*—Let a word be introduced from a foreign language; let it have some resemblance in sound to a true native term; lastly, let the meanings of the two words be not absolutely incompatible. We may then have a word of foreign origin taking the appearance of an English one. Such, amongst others, are *beef-eater*, from *bœuffetier*; *sparrow-grass* = *asparagus*; *Shotover** = *Chateau-vert*; *Jerusalem*† = *Girasole*; *Spanish beefeater* = *spina bifida*; *periwig* = *peruke*; *runagate* = *renegade*; *lutestring* = *lustrino*; ‡ *O yes* = *Oyez*; *ancient* = *ensign*.§

Dog-cheap.—This has nothing to do with *dogs*. The first syllable is *god* = *good* transposed, and the second the *ch-p* in *chapman* (= *merchant*) *cheap*, and *Eastcheap*. In Sir J. Mandeville, we find *god-kepe* = *good bargain*.

Sky-larking.—Nothing to do with larks of any sort; still less the particular species *alauda arvensis*. The word improperly spelt *l-a-r-k*, and banished to the slang regions of the English language, is simply *lác* = *game*, or

* As in *Shotover Hill*, near Oxford. † As in *Jerusalem artichoke*.

‡ A sort of silk. § *Ancient Cassio*—Othello.

sport; wherein the *a* is sounded as in *father* (not as in *farther*). *Lek* = *game*, in the present Scandinavian languages.

Zachary Macaulay = *Zumalacarregui*; *Billy Ruffian* = *Bellerophon*; *Sir Roger Dowlass* = *Surojah Dowlah*, although so limited to the common soldiers and sailors who first used them, as to be exploded vulgarisms rather than integral parts of the language, are examples of the same tendency towards the irregular accommodation of misunderstood foreign terms.

Birdbolt.—An incorrect name for the *gadus lota*, or *eelpout*, and a transformation of *barbote*.

Whistle-fish.—The same for *gadus mustela*, or *weazel-fish*.

Liquorice = *glycyrrhiza*.

A full and curious list of these words, by Mr. Wedgwood, is to be found in the Transactions of the Philological Society for 1855; which gives, as additions to the preceding—

<i>Belfry</i>	<i>beffroi, French.</i>
<i>Brickwall</i> (in tennis)	<i>bricoler, French.</i> •
<i>Baggage</i> (worthless woman)	<i>baggasse, French.</i>
<i>Crawfish</i>	<i>écrevisse, French.</i>
<i>Country-dance</i>	<i>contredanse, French.</i>
<i>Causeway</i>	<i>chaussée, French.</i>
<i>Charterhouse</i>	<i>chartreuse, French.</i>
<i>Curtal-axe</i>	<i>cortelazo, Italian.</i>
<i>Dormouse</i>	<i>dormeuse, French.</i>
<i>Doublet</i>	<i>guibetto, Italian.</i>
<i>Gilliflower</i>	<i>giroflée, French.</i>
<i>Gracechurch Street</i>	<i>Gracious street.</i>
<i>Gum Benjamin</i>	<i>benzoin.</i>
<i>Gum Dragon</i>	<i>tragacanth, Greek.</i>
<i>Humble-bee</i>	<i>bombilus, Latin.</i>
<i>Lanyard</i>	<i>lanière, French.</i>
<i>Miniature</i>	<i>miniatura,* Latin.</i>
<i>Nancy Cousins Bay</i>	<i>Anse des Cousins, French.</i>
<i>Penthouse</i>	<i>appentier, French.</i>

* From *minimum* = *vermillion*. Nothing to do with *minuo* = *diminish*.

<i>St. Ubes</i>	<i>Setubal, Portuguese.</i>
<i>Tuberoze</i>	<i>tubereuse, French.</i>
<i>Waistcoat</i>	<i>veste, French.</i>

In order for a word to be thus disguised, it is not necessary that it should be foreign to the German class of languages, or even to the English division. Thus—*Bridgewater* = *Burgh Walter*; *breech* = *flog* = *britschen* or *pritschen*, German, and has nothing to do with *breeches*; *court-cards* = *coat-cards*; *decoy* = *duck* + *cooy* (the Dutch being *entekooi* = *duck cage*), and has nothing to do with *coy* = *allure* = *righteous* = *rightwise*; *shame-faced* = *shamfast*; *uproar* = *aufrohr* in German, from *ruhren* = *stir*, and has nothing to do with *roar* from the Latin *rugio*: *posture-maker* = *boetsen-maker*, Dutch, from *boetsen* = *possen* (German) = *tricks*. The old form of *livelihood* is *lifelode*; of *fieldfare*, *fealo-far*, where *fealow* = *tawny*, and has nothing to do with fields. *Gooseberry* = *kruisebeer* (Dutch), and has nothing to do with *geese*. The older and more correct name for *Poland* was *Polayn*; the German being *Pohlen*. The origin of the word is *Polyane* = *plains*; the *-d* being entirely catachrestic. *Wormwood* = *were-muth*; and has nothing to do with either worms or wood.

§ 121. Sometimes the transformation of the *name* has engendered a change in the object to which it applies, or, at least, has evolved new ideas in connection with it. How easy for a person who used the words *beef-eater*, *sparrow-grass*, or *Jerusalem artichoke*, to believe that the officers designated by the former either ate, or used to eat, more beef than other people; that the second word was the name for a grass or herb of which *sparrows* were fond; and that *Jerusalem artichokes* came from Palestine. To account for the name *Shotover-hill*, I have heard that Little John shot over it. Of *Leighton Buzzard* = *Leighton Beau-desert*, Mr. Westwood tells us that the eagle which serves

as a lectern in the parish church is believed to be the buzzard that gave the name to the town. In these, and similar, cases the confusion, in order to set itself right, breeds a fiction.

Sometimes, when the form of a word in respect to its *sound* is not affected, a false spirit of accommodation introduces an unetymological *spelling*; as *frontispiece* from *frontispecium*, *sovereign* from *sovrano*, *colleague* from *collega*, *lanthorn* (old orthography) from *lanterna*.

The value of forms like these consists in their showing that language is affected by false etymologies as well as by true ones.

§ 122. In *lambkin* and *lancet*, the final syllables (*-kin* and *-et*) have much the same power. They both express the idea of smallness or diminutiveness. These words are but two out of a multitude, the one (*lamb*) being of English, the other (*lance*) of Norman origin. The same is the case with the superadded syllables: *-kin* being English, *-et* Norman. Now, to add an English termination to a Norman word, or *vice versâ*, is to corrupt the language; as may be seen by saying either *lance-kin*, or *lamb-et*. This leads to some observations respecting the Hybridism, a term derived from *hybrid-a=a mongrel*, a Latin word of Greek extraction.

The terminations *-ize* (as in *criticize*), *-ism* (as in *criticism*), *-ic* (as in *comic*)—these, amongst many others, are Greek. To add them to words not of Greek origin is to be guilty of hybridism. Hence, *witticism* is objectionable.

The terminations *-ble* (as in *penetrable*), *-bility* (as in *penetrability*), *-al* (as in *parental*), these, amongst many others, are Latin terminations. To add them to words not of Latin origin is to be guilty of hybridism.

Hybridism is the commonest fault that accompanies the introduction of new words, the hybrid additions to

the English language being most numerous in works on science.

It must not, however, be concealed that several well-established words are hybrid; and that even in the writings of the classical Roman authors, there is hybridism between the Latin and the Greek.

Nevertheless, the strict etymological view of every word of foreign origin is, not that it is put together in England, but that it is brought whole from the language to which it is vernacular. Now, no derived word can be brought whole from a language unless, in that language, all its parts exist. The word *penetrability* is not derived from the English word *penetrable*, by the addition of *-ty*. It is the Latin word *penetrabilitas* imported. Hence, *in derived words all the parts must belong to one and the same language*, or, changing the expression, *every derived word must have a possible form in the language from which it is taken*.

§ 123. A true word sometimes takes the appearance of a hybrid, without really being so. The *-icle*, in *icicle*, is apparently the same as the *-icle* in *radicle*; and as *-ice* is German and *-icle* classical, hybridism is simulated. *Ice*, however, is not a derivative, but a compound; its parts being *is* and *gicel*, both English words.

“Be she constant, be she fickle,
Be she flame, or be she ickle.”—SIR C. SEDLEY.

§ 124. *On incompleteness of the Radical.* Let there be in a given language a series of roots ending in *-t*, as *semat*. Let a euphonic influence eject the *-t*, as often as the word occurs in the nominative case. Let the nominative case be considered to represent the root, or radical, of the word. Let a derivative word be formed accordingly, *i. e.* on the notion that the nominative form and the radical form coincide. Such a derivative will exhibit only

a part of the root ; in other words, the radical will be incomplete. Now, all this is what actually takes place in words like *hæmo-ptysis* (*spitting of blood*), *sema-phore* (*a sort of telegraph*). The Greek imparisyllabics eject a part of the root in the nominative case ; the radical forms being *hæmat-* and *semat-*, not *hæm-* and *sem-*. Incompletion of the radical is one of the commonest causes of words being coined faultily. It must not, however, be concealed, that even in the classical writers, we have, in words like *δίστομος* and a few others, examples of incompletion of the radical.

§ 125. The preceding chapters have paved the way for a distinction between the *historical* analysis of a language and the *logical* analysis of one. Let the present language of England (for the illustration's sake only) consist of 40,000 words. Of these, let 30,000 be Anglo-Saxon, 5000 Anglo-Norman, 100 Keltic, 10 Latin of the first, 20 Latin of the second, and 30 Latin of the third period, 50 Scandinavian, and the rest miscellaneous. In this case the language is considered according to the origin of the words that compose it, and the analysis is an *historical* analysis. But it is very evident that the English, or any other language, is capable of being contemplated in another view, and that the same number of words may be very differently classified. Instead of arranging them according to the languages whence they are derived, let them be disposed according to the meanings that they convey. Let it be said, for instance, that out of 40,000 words 10,000 are the names of natural objects, that 1000 denote abstract ideas, that 1000 relate to warfare, 1000 to church matters, 500 to points of chivalry, 1000 to agriculture, and so on throughout. In this case, the analysis is not historical but *logical* ; the words being classed not according to their *origin*, but according to their *meaning*. Now the logical and histori-

cal analysis of a language generally, in some degree, coincide; that is, terms for a certain set of ideas come from certain languages. In English a large proportion of our chemical terms are Arabic, whilst a still larger one of our legal ones are Anglo-Norman.

CHAPTER XXI.

ON THE DIALECTS OF THE ANGLO-SAXON.—THE WEST-SAXON.—THE NORTHUMBRIAN.—THE GLOSSES OF THE RUSHWORTH GOSPELS.—THE DURHAM GOSPELS.—THE RITUAL.—THE RUTHWELL CROSS.—THE COTTON PSALTER.

§ 126. THE Anglo-Saxon fell into dialects and sub-dialects, concerning which we know something, but not much. The northern forms of speech stood in pretty strong contrast to the southern. We have not many specimens of the Northumbrian; but we have enough to enable us to say this. The dialect in which nearly all the remains of our old language are embodied is that of Wessex—indeed, for practical purposes, *Anglo-Saxon* means *West-Saxon*. Of the East Anglian of Norfolk and Suffolk we know little, of the Mercian less.

The points of difference between the West-Saxon and the Northumbrian, upon which we must most particularly concentrate our attention, are the following:—

1. The details connected with the demonstrative pronoun; remembering that out of it has grown what is called the pronoun of the third person, as well as the definite article—*he, heo, hit—se, seo—þæt, þeir, þa, þe*, or, in the present language, *he, it—she—that, they, the*.

2. The oblique cases in *-n*; like *steorran, tungan, &c.*

3. The plurals in *-an* (*munec-an*), as contrasted with those in *-as* (*munec-as* = *monks*).

4. The infinitives; whether they end in *-an* or *-a*.

5. The first person singular; whether it ends in *-e* or *-o*.

6. The second person singular; whether it ends in *-is* or *-ist*.

7. The three persons of the plural; whether they end in *-þ* or *-s*.

8. The forms signifying *am*, *art*, *is*, *are*, *be*, *was*, &c.

9. The form of the participle; whether it begins with, or without, *ge-* or *y*.

These require attention, because it is in respect to these that the two typical forms of the Anglo-Saxon chiefly differ from each other. Such the marks of difference. How are they distributed? Some characterize the *West-Saxon*: some the *Northumbrian* form of speech.

§ 127. *West-Saxon division*.—For the West-Saxon, *i. e.* the Angle of Wessex, the works of Alfred and Ælfric may be taken as the chief samples; indeed they should do more than this; they should form the centre of a group round which the others are arranged. This is because, unlike the majority of Anglo-Saxon compositions, we know who wrote them, and we know when they were written. Knowing this we use them as types. Of the Gospels, of the Exeter and Vercelli MSS., and of Beowulf, we only know that they belong to the same division.

1. The West-Saxon article is *se*, *seo*, *þæt*=ð, ð, *to* in Greek, and like the Greek ð, ð, *to*, it consists of one word for the masculine and feminine genders of the nominative case, and another for the neuter and the oblique cases. Thus *þone*=τοῦ; *þære*=της, τη; *þām*=τῷ; *þæs*=του; *þara*=των. In other words, the definite pronoun was used as an article, and its inflection was a full one;—consisting chiefly in forms of the root *þ-*, but also in *se* and *seo*. Meanwhile, the inflection of *he* was *he*, *heo*, *hit*;

heo being used where we use *she*; and *she*, itself, being from *seo*, the definite article of the West-Saxons. Thirdly; the equivalents to *they*, *them*, and *their*, were *hi*, *him*, *heora*, plurals of *he*.

2, 3. The West-Saxon genitive of *steorra* = *star*, was *steorr-an*. The nominative plural was also *steorr-an*.

4. The West-Saxon infinitives ended in *-an*, as *lufi-an* = *love*. All this indicates a liking for terminations in *-n*.

5. The first person singular of the present indicative ended in *-e*; as *ic bærn-e* = *I burn*.

6. The second person singular ended in *es-t*.

7. The plural was *wi bærn-aþ*, *gi bærn-aþ*, *hi bærn-aþ* = *we*, *ye*, *they burn*.

8. Where *we say*, *we are*, *ye are*, *they are*, the West Saxons said, *wi syndon*, *gi syndon*, *hi syndon*, or (later) *wi synd*, *gi synd*, *hi synd*. This is the German *seyn*—a word wholly wanting to the present English.

9. The W. S. prefixed *ge-* to the past participle; as *ge-lufod* = *loved*.

§ 128. The West-Saxon belonged to the South, the Northumbrian to the North of our island. The names alone tell us this. The fact, however, is anything but an unimportant one. In the first place it induces us to ask, where are the dialects of the intervening districts, the East Anglian of Suffolk and Norfolk, and the Mercian of Northampton and Derby? To this the answer is unsatisfactory. Few samples of them are known; and, even in the few we have, there is none in which a West-Saxon influence is not discernible. Again, it shows that the assumption of any real difference between the Angle and the Saxon, as an explanation of any differences between the West-Saxon and the Northumbrian is gratuitous. The dialects in question differ as the dialects of two geographical extremes.

Again—the provincial dialects of the present time can be shown to graduate into each other—at least, to a great extent. This is because we have specimens from nearly every county. For the Anglo-Saxon dialects we have a great gap.

§ 129. *Northumbrian Division*.—Premising that *Northumbrian* means *North of the Humber*, and that (so doing) it includes Yorkshire, I draw attention to the fragmentary or rudimentary character of the class denoted by the term. Compared with the West Saxon in respect to its literature, it is little more than a local dialect. Indeed, its extant literature, in the higher sense of the word, is *nil*. It consists, if we limit ourselves to the records of which the time and place are ascertained, and the translation is satisfactory, to little more than three sets of glosses, and one inscription.

1. *The Glosses of the Rushworth Gospels*.—The glosses on the Rushworth Gospels are referred by Wanley, whose opinion is adopted by Mr. Garnett, to the end of the ninth, or to the beginning of the tenth, century. This, however, is by no means certain. The place at which, at least, a portion of them was written seems to have been Harwood, in Wharfedale. If so, they give us the most southern sample of the division to which they belong. The names of the writers are known. There were two—one of them being named Farmenn. He it is who describes himself as a priest at Harawuda. The first part of the interlineation is his, and it is remarkable that the Northumbrian character is less marked in Farmenn's part than it is in his coadjutor's: whose name was Owen—a British designation. The following specimen is from Mr. Garnett's paper on the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands; the peculiar forms being in *Italics*. The Rev. B. Bandinel has kindly collated each sample with the original MS. in the Bodleian.

RUSHWORTH GOSPELS.

JOHN, chap. iv.

þæt forþon [þe hælend] ongætt
[þætte] giherdon þa *alðe* wearas
þætte *the* hæl[end] monige thegnas
wyrceþ and *fulwath* þonne Ioh'
[annes]: (*þe* þe, I' swa he, þe hæl'
ne *fulwade* ah þegnas his:) forleort
Judcam *corpo* and *foerde* efter sona
in Galileam. was *gi* dæfendlic wu-
tudl'[ice] hine þætte of'[er] *foerde*
þerh tha burig [Samaría]. com for-
þon in tha cæstre Samar', þio is
gi cweden Sichar, neh *þær byrig*
þætte *salde* Jacob Josepes suno his.
was wutudl' ther wælla Jacobes.
The hæl' forþon *woerig* was of
gonge, sitende was, and sæt, swa
ofer þam *wælla*: tid was swelce þio
sexta. wif [com] of *thær byrig* to
hladanne þæt wæter, cwæth him þe
hæl'; *sel* me *drinca*. þegnas wutudl'.
foerdun in cæstre þætte mete *bohtun*
him. cwæth f'þon to him þæt wif
þio Samaritanesca, hu thu Judesc
mith thy *arþ* drincende from me
giowes tu þa þe mith thy wif's [sic?]
Samaritanesc? ne for þon *gi*byrellic
biþ Judea to Samaritaniscum. *gi*ond-
swarade *the* hæl' and cwæp him,
gif þu *wistes* hus Godes and hwelc
were se the cwæth the *sel* me *drinca*
þu wutudl'. and woenis mara, gif thu
georwades [giowades?] from him and
[he] *gisalde* the water cwic welle.
cwæth to him þæt wif, driht [en]
ne m [in?] hwon tha hlado hæfest
þu, and the pytt neh is: hwona,
and hwer, forthon hæfest þu wæter
cwicw elle? ah ne *arþu* mara feder
usum Jacobe sepe *salde* us *thiosne*
pytt, and *wælla*, and he of him
dranc and suno his and feoþofoto,
and nægno [netenu], his?

HATTON GOSPELS.

JOHN, chap. iv.

Ða se hælend wiste þæt þa phari-
sei gehyrden. þæt hē hæfdeema
leorning enihta þonne johannes
þeah se hælend ne fullode ac hys
leorning enihtas. Ða forlet he
judea land and for eft on galilea.
hým ge byrode þæt he seolde
faran þurh samaria land Wicelice
he com on samarian cestre. þe ys
ge nemneth sichar. neah þam
tune þe jacob sealde Josepe hys
sune. þær was jacobes wýlle.
Se hælend sæt æt þā welle. þa
he was weri gegan and hyt was
middaȝg. Ða com þær an wif of
samaria wolde water feccā. Ða
cwæð se hælend to hýre. gýf me
drincan. Hys leorning enihtes
ferdon þa to þære ceastre woldon
hoom ruete beggen. Ða cwæð þæt
samaritanisse wif to hým. Hu
mete bydst þu at me drenken.
þonne þu ert Judeisc. and ic em
samaritanise wýf. Ne brucað Ju-
deas and samaritanisse metes at
gadere. Ða answered se hælend
and cwæð to hýre. Gif þu wistes
godes gýfe and hwæt se ȝs þe
cwæð to þe sele me drinken.
witodlice þu bede hyne þæt he
sealde þe lyfes wæter. þa cwæð
þæt wif to hým. Leof ne þu
næfst nan þing mid to hlade,
and þet ȝs deop. hwanen hafst
þu lyfes wæter cwest ðu þæt þu
marc ȝ þonne ure fader iacob.
Se þe us þisne pyt sealde, and
he hys bearn and hys nýtanu of
þam druncan.

2. *The Glosses of the Durham, or Lindisfarn, Gospels.—Quatuor Evangelia Latina, ex translatione S. Hieronymi, cum glossâ interlineatâ Saxonica.*—Cotton MSS. Nero, D. 4.

MATTHEW, cap. 2.

miððy arod (?) gecenned were haelend in ðær byrig
 Cum ergo natus esset Jesus in Bethleem Judæe
 in dagum Herodes cyninges heonu ða tungulcræftga of eustdael
 in diebus Herodis Regis, ecce magi ab oriente
 cweoðondo
 cwomun to hierusalem hiu cwoedon huer is ðe acenned
 venerunt Hierosolymam, dicentes, Ubi est qui natus
 tungul
 is cynig Judeunu gesegon we forðon sterru his in
 est rex Judeorum? vidimus enim stellam ejus in
 eustdael and we cwomon to worðanne hine geherde wiototlice
 oriente et venimus adorare eum. Audiens autem
 ða burgwærnas
 herodes se cynig gedroefed wæs and alle ða hierusalemisca mið
 Herodes turbatus est et omnis Hierosolyma cum
 mesapreusti
 him and gesomnode alle ða aldormenn bi-copa
 illo. Et congregatis (sic) omnes principes sacerdotum
 geascode
 and ða uðuutta ðæs folces georne gefragnde fra him huer crist
 et scribas populi, sciscitabatur ab iis ubi Christus
 acenned were.
 nasceretur.

3. *The Glosses of the Durham Ritual.—Rituale Ecclesiæ Dunhelmensis.*

1145, c. 10. *Rituale Ecclesiæ Dunhelmensis.—Hæ sunt capitula in Litania Majore, þæt is, on fifu dagas.**

1. { ðas cvoeð drikt ymbhwurfað woegas hieru' and
 { Hæc dicit Dominus, circuite vias Hierusalem, et
 bihaldað and giseawað and soecað in plægiword and on placævm and
 aspice et considerate, et querite in plateis ejus an
 gimoeton gie woer doend dom and soecende lfv and
 inueniat virum facientem judicium et querentem fidem et
 milsend ic biom his
 propitius ero ejus.
2. { stondað of woegas and giseað and gifraignað of sedvm
 { State super vias et videte et interrogate de semitis

* *Rituale Ecclesiæ Dunhelmensis*, published by the Surtees Society, pp. 36. 37.

- aldum hvoele sie woeg god and geongað on ðær and
antiquis quæ sit via bona, et ambulate in ea, et
gi gimoetað coelnisse sawlum iwrum
invenietis refrigerium animabus vestris
3. { alles hergies god Isr'l godo doað woegas iuero and
Exercituum Deus Israel, bonas facite vias vestras et
rædo ivr' and ic bya ivih mið in stove ðissvm on eorde þe
stadia vestra, et habitabo vobiscum in loco isto in terra quam
ic salde faedorum iurvm fro worvðe and w' worvðe
dedi patribus vestris a seculo et usque in seculum
1. { god ðv ðe [dæg] gisceadas from naehte dedo vssa from
Deus, qui diem discernis a nocte actus nostros a
ðiostra giscead miste þatte symle ða ðe haelgo aron
tenebrarum distingue caligine ut semper quæ sancta sunt
ðeucendo in ðinum symlinga leht ve lifa ð
meditantes, in tua jugiter luce vivamus per D'
2. { gefeðonegunco gidoe ve driht' haelga faeder allm'
Gratias agimus, Domine, sancte pater omnipotens
ece god ðv ðe vsig oferdoene naehtes rume to morgenlicum
æterne Deus, qui nos, transacto noctis spatio, ad matutinas
tidvm ðerhlaede gimoeðvmað arð ve bid' þatte ðv gefe vs [dæg]
horas perducere dignatus es, quesumus, ut dones nobis diem
ðeosne bvtan synne of fura oð þat to efenne ðe gode
hunc sine peccato transire quatenus ad vesperum tibi Deo
geafo eft ve bringa ð
gratias referamus, per Dominum.

4. *The Ruthwell Runes.*—The inscription in Anglo-Saxon Runic letters, on the Ruthwell Cross, is thus deciphered and translated by Mr. Kemble:—

. mik. me.
Riiknæ kyningk	The powerful King,
Hifunæs hlafard,	The Lord of Heaven,
Hælda ic ne dærstæ.	I dared not hold.
Bismerede* ungket men,	They reviled us two,
Bā ætgæd[r]e,	Both together,
lk (u)iðbædi bist(e)me(d)	I stained with the pledge of crime.
.
. geredæ prepared

* This dual occurs in the present provincial dialect of the parts about Essen. Thus—Q. “*Wat deit hā do!*” A. *Ek segg et ink nich—Git mögget sū mi awer jayen.*—Q. *What does he there?* A. *I will not say to you—ye two so may not chase me.* It has often, perhaps generally, a plural power.

Hinæ gamældæc	Himself spake
Estig, ða he walde	Benignantly, when he would
An galgu gistiga	Go up upon the cross,
Môdig fore	Courageously before
Men,	Men
.
.
Mid stralum giwundæd,	Wounded with shafts,
Alegdun hiæ hinæ,	They laid him down,
Limwêrige.	Limb-weary.
Gistodun him . . .	They stood by him.
.
Krist was on rôdi ;	Christ was on cross.
Hwcðræ ther fûsæ	Lo ! there with speed
Fearran cwomu	From afar came
Æððilæ ti lænum.	Nobles to him in misery.
Ic that al bih (côld)	I that all beheld
. sæc (. . .)
Ic w(æ)s mi(d) ga(l)gu	I was with the cross
Æ (. . .) rôd . ha
.

§ 130. So much for our materials for the Northumbrian dialect of the Anglo-Saxon ; at least for the most unexceptionable portion of them. The characteristics they supply are as follows :—

1. The article is *pe* rather than *se* ; and *pio* rather than *seo*, &c. In the modern English *the* is used without respect to either gender or case. There is a tendency to this in the Northumbrian. Again—the use of *they*, &c., instead of *hi*, *hem*, *heora*, as the plural forms of *he* and *heo*, sets in earlier in Northumbria than in Wessex.

2, 3. The *-n*, or *-an*, both in the oblique cases and in the Nominative Plural, is dropped. Sometimes the termination is *-u* ; as *witgu* = W. S., *witegan* = *prophets*. Sometimes it is *-o* ; as *ego* = W. S., *eagan* = *eyes*. Generally, however, it is *-a* or *-e*, as

NORTH.	W. S.	ENGLISH
hearta	heartan	<i>hearts.</i>
earthe	earthan	<i>earth's.</i>
nome	naman	<i>names.</i>

4. The *-n* of the Infinitives is similarly dropped.

NORTH.	W. S.	ENGLISH
cucetha	cweðan	say.
ingeonga	ingangan	enter.

5. The first person singular of the present indicative ends (1) in *-u*; as *ic getreow-u*, *ic cleopi-u*, *ic sel-u*, *ic ondred-u*, *ic ageld-u*, *ic getimbr-u* = *I believe*, *I call*, *I give*, *I dread*, *I pay*, *I build*—(2) in *-o*; as *ic sitt-o*, *ic drinc-o*, *ic fett-o*, *ic wuldrig-o*, = *I sit*, *I drink*, *I fight*, *I glorify*.

6. The second person singular ends in *-s*, rather than *-st*.

7. The plural termination was *-s*. This form, however, was not universal. It is in the imperative mood where we find it most generally, and where it is retained the longest. Elsewhere the form in *þ* is found besides.

8. The plural of *am*, *art*, *is*, is

NORTHUMBRIAN.		WEST-SAXON.
<i>wi aren</i>	} as opposed to	<i>wi syndon.</i>
<i>gi aren</i>		<i>gi syndon.</i>
<i>hi aren</i>		<i>hi syndon.</i>

9. In the participles the W. S. prefixes *ge-*, the Northumbrian often omits it.

§ 131. Upon these *differentiæ* we may remark—

1. That the use of *þe* and *þio*, as opposed to *se* and *seo*, is Frisian. Not that the Frisians discarded *se* and *seo* altogether. On the contrary they used them freely. They used them, however, only as Demonstratives in the strict sense of the term. They used them where the Greeks used *οὗτος*. Meanwhile, where the Greeks used *ὁ* and *ἡ*, the Frisians used *the* and *thju*. On the other hand the tendency towards the undeclined *þe* is a tendency towards the modern English.

2, 3. The omission of the *-n* in the inflection of nouns is also Frisian.

4. So is that of the *-n* in the infinitive mood.

FRISIAN.	WEST-SAXON.	ENGLISH.
<i>mak-a</i>	<i>maci-an</i>	<i>make.</i>
<i>ler-a</i>	<i>lær-an</i>	<i>learn.</i>
<i>bærn-a</i>	<i>bærn-an</i>	<i>burn.</i>

5. The termination in *-u* for the first person singular is Old Saxon.

6. So is that of the second person in *-s*, rather than *-st*.

7. The plural in *-s* is, at the present time, provincial in the North of England. In Scotland it belonged to the literary dialect. It appears in the works of James I. throughout.

8. The forms *aren* approach the modern English; meanwhile, the Old Frisian forms are *wi send*, *I send*, *hja send*.

§ 132. Which of the two divisions of the A. S. gives us the older form of language? No general answer can be given. Thus—

1. Supposing that the *-s* in *se* and *seo* represent an original *p*, the Northumbrian forms (*pe* and *þio*) are the older. The origin, however, of the *se* is doubtful.

2, 3, 4. Of the forms in *-n* and *-a*, the West Saxon are the older.

5, 6. On the other hand, the antiquity is in favour of the Northumbrian verbs in *-u*, and *-o*.

7. Of the plurals, however, the West Saxon *p* is the older.

8. So is the *ge-*, of the participles.

All this means that different portions of a language change at different rates, and that general assertions as to the greater antiquity of one dialect over another are unsafe.

§ 133. Another caution arises out of the preceding notices: a caution against drawing over-hasty conclusions from partial details.

1. To a certain extent the Northumbrian approaches the standard English of our modern literature, *e. g.* in the use of *the* and *are*. Yet it would be unsafe to say that it is out of the Northumbrian that the literary English has grown.

2. To a certain extent the Northumbrian approaches the Old Saxon.

3. To a certain extent the Northumbrian approaches the Old Norse; and as the points in common to the two languages have commanded no little attention, they will be considered somewhat fully—not, however, until some miscellaneous additions to the preceding notices have been made.

§ 134. Many investigators increase the list of Northumbrian *characteristics* by going into the differences of phonesis. Doing this, they are enabled to state that the West Saxon has a tendency, wanting in the Northumbrian, to place the sound of the *y* in *yet* (written *e*) before certain vowels—Thus, the West Saxon *eale*, pronounced *yal*, is contrasted with the Northumbrian *all*. This seems a real difference; and one which no one should overlook. Again—*thorh* and *leht*, as contrasted with the W. S. *theorh* and *leoht*, give us appreciable differences of sound. So does *thoede* = W. S. *theoda*. In words, however, like

NORTH.			W. S.	
<i>Deg</i>	}	contrasted with	}	<i>dæg</i> day.
<i>Fet</i>				<i>fæt</i> vessel.

the difference of pronunciation is, by no means, so clear as the difference of spelling.

Again—until I know exactly how to sound the W. S. *é* as opposed to the Northumbrian *oe*, I must suspend my judgment as to the import of such a table as the following:—

NORTH.	W. S.	ENGLISH
boen	bén	<i>prayer.</i>
boec	béc	<i>books.</i>
coelan	célan	<i>cool.</i>
doeman	déman	<i>deem.</i>
foedan	fédan	<i>feed.</i>
spoed	spéd	<i>speed.</i>
sweet	swét	<i>sweet.</i>
woenan	wénan	<i>ween.</i>

upon which all that can be said is, that the West Saxon *looks* most like the modern English. The orthography of the Ruthwell Runes is not the orthography of the Glosses.

§ 135. Many investigators increase the list of Northumbrian *compositions* by the two following fragments; the first of which is known as *Wanley's Fragment of Ceadmon*, the second as *The Death-bed Verses of Beda*.

The Anglo-Saxon monk Ceadmon was born at Whitby in Northumberland. Yet the form in which his great work has come down to us is *West-Saxon*. This has engendered the notion that the original has been re-cast, and lost; with the exception of the following* fragment printed by Wanley from an ancient MS., and by Hickes from Beda's *Hist. Ecclesiast.* 4—24.*

Nu scylun hergan	Nu we sceolan her'gean	Now we should praise
Hefaen ricaes uard,	Heofon-rices weard,	The heaven-kingdom's preserver,
Metudæs mæcti,	Metodes mihte,	The might of the Creator,
End his modgidanc.	And his móðgethanc.	And his mood-thought.
Uerc uuldur fadur,	Wera wuldor fæder,	The glory-father of works,
Sue he uundra gihwæs,	Sva he wuldres gehwæs,	As he, of wonders, each
Eci drictin,	Ecé drihten,	Eternal Lord,
Ora stelidæ.	Ord onstealde.	Originally established.
He aerist scopæ,	He æ'rest scóp,	He erst shaped,
Elda barnum,	Eorðan bearnum,	For earth's bairns,
Heben til hrofe;	Heofon tó rófe;	Heaven to roof;
Haleg scepen :	Hálig scyppend :	Holy shaper ;

* Collated with the original MSS. in the University Library, by H. Bradshaw, Esq., of King's College.

Tha middun-geard,	Dá middangeard,	Then mid-earth,
Moncynnaes uard,	Moncýnnes weard,	Mankind's home,
Rei dryctin,	Kce drihten,	Eternal Lord,
Æfter tiadæ,	Æfter teóde,	After formed,
Firum foldu,	Firum foldan,	For the homes of men,
Frea allmectig.	Freá ælmihtig.	Lord Almighty.

The death-bed verses of Beda are from a MS. at St. Gallen.

Fore the neidfaerae,	Before the necessary journey,
Naenig uuiurthit	No one becomes
Thoc-snotturra	Wiser of thought
Than him tharf sie	Than him need be,
To ymlhycganne,	To consider;
Aer his hionongae,	Before his departure,
Hunet, his gastae,	What, for his spirit,
Godaes aeththa yflaes,	Of good or evil,
Æfter deothdaege,	After death-day,
Doemid uuieorthae.	Shall be doomed.

It is not safe, however, to say more than that the orthography is other than West-Saxon.

§ 136. The same applies to the Cotton MS. (Vespasian, A. 1.), of a Latin Psalter, with an interlinear gloss in Anglo-Saxon: of which the Latin element is referred to the seventh, the Angle to the ninth, century. It is this from which the words of § 134 are taken; and, doubtless, the orthography is other than the standard West-Saxon. (1.) The plurals end in *-u*. (2.) The second persons singular in *-s*. (3.) Its past participles omit the initial *-ge*. Thus:

PSALTER.	IN W. S.	ENGLISH.
hered	geherod	<i>praised.</i>
bledsad	gebletsod	<i>blessed.</i>
soth	gesoght	<i>sought.</i>

4. Its personal pronouns are *mec, thec, usic, eowic*, rather than *me, the, us, eow*, as in West-Saxon.

Are there sufficient reasons for making it Northumbrian? Good investigators have made it so. Meanwhile let it be noted that the infinitive ends in *-n*—not in *-a*.

PSALMUS XLII.

1. { doem mec god and to-scad intingan minne of ðeode
Judica me Deus et discerne causam meam de gente
noht haligre from men un-rehtum and facnum ge-nere me
non sancta ab homine iniquo et doloso eripe me
2. { for-ðon ðu earð god min and strengu min for-hwon me
Quia tu es Deus meus et fortitudo mea quare me
on-weg a-ðrife ðu and for-hwon un-rot ic in-ga ðonne swenceð mec
reppulisti et quare tristis incedo dum adfligit me
se feond
inimicus
3. { on-send leht ðin and soð-festnisse ðine hie mec
Emitte lucem tuam et veritatem tuam ipsa me de-
ge-laedon and to-ge-laeddon in munte ðam halgan ðinum and in
duxerunt et adduxerunt in monte sancto tuo et in
ge-telde ðinum
tabernaculo tuo
4. { ic in-gaa to wi-bede godes to gode se ge-blisseað iu-
Introibo ad altare Dei ad Deum qui lætificat juven-
guðe mine
tutem meam
5. { ic ondetto ðe in citran god god min for-hwon
Confitebor tibi in cythara Deus Deus meus Quare
un-rot earðu sawul min and for-hwon ge-droefes me
tristis es anima mea et quare conturbas me
6. { ge-lyht in god for-ðon ic-ondettu him hælu ondwlēotan
Spera in Deum quoniam confitebor illi salutare vultus
mines and god min.
mei et Deus meus.

PSALMUS XLIII.

2. { god mid earum urum we ge-herdun and fedras ure
Deus auribus nostris audivimus et patres nostri annun-
segdun us
ciaverunt nobis
were ðæt wircende ðu earð in degum heara and in dægum
Opus quod operatus es in diebus eorum et in diebus
ðam alldum
antiquis
3. { honda ðine ðeode to-stenceð and ðu ge-plantades hie ðu swentes
Manus tua gentes disperdet et plantasti eos adflixisti
folc and on-weg a-ðrife hie
populos et expulisti eos

4. { na-les soð-lice in sweorde his ge-sittað eorðan and earm
 { Nec enim in gladio suo possidebunt terram et brachium
 heara ne ge-hæleð hie
 eorum non salvabit eos
 ah sie swiðre din and earm ðin and in-lihtnis ondweletan
 Sed dextera tua et brachium tuum et inluminatio vultus
 ðines for-ðon ge-licade ðe in him
 tui quoniam complacuit tibi in illis
5. { ðu earð se ilca cyning min and god min ðu on-bude
 { Tu es ipse rex meus et Deus meus qui mandas sa-
 haelu
 lutem Jacob
6. { in ðe fiord ure we windwiað and in noman ðinum
 { In te inimicos nostros ventilavimus et in nomine tuo
 we for-hycgað a-risende in us
 spernemus insurgentes in nos
7. { na-les soð-lice in bogan minum ic ge-hyto and sweord min ne ge-
 { Non enim arcu meo sperabo et gladius meus non sal-
 hæleð me
 vabit me
8. { ðu ge-freades soð-lice usic of ðam swencendum usic and ða ða usic
 { Salvasti enim nos ex adfigentibus nos et eos qui nos
 fiedon ðu ge-steaðelaðes
 oderunt confudisti
9. { in gode we bioð here allne deg and in noman dinum we-
 { In Deo laudabimur tota die et in nomine tuo confi-
 ondettað in weorulde
 tebimur in saecula.

§ 137. It was stated in § 133 that the question concern-
 ing the Norse elements in the Northumbrian forms of
 speech stood over until certain preliminary remarks had
 been made: this was because the date and place of the
 Psalter enter into the investigation. Let the date of the
 Ritual be A.D. 970—as it probably is. Let the Psalter
 be older than the Ritual: as certain opinions make it—
 opinions which the present writer objects to, believing
 them to be founded on an undue assumption. Let
 the Psalter be Northumbrian—as, with the exception of
 its infinitives ending in *-an*—it is. Let the infinitives

in *-a* of the Gospels, the Ritual, and the Ruthwell Runes, be looked upon as Danish rather than Frisian by one critic, and as Frisian rather than Danish by another. What follows? Even this—that the advocate of the Danish doctrine has a strong case in his favour, when he looks at the dates of the Danish invasions: for he may say that if the Northumbrian peculiarities were Frisian, they would have existed from the first; whereas, being Norse, we miss them at the beginning, but find them at the end, of the Danish, period. Such is the suggestion of Mr. Garnett, who, after remarking that the termination in *-a* was Norse, and that the *older* text of the Psalter failed to exhibit it, commits himself to the opinion that it may be the result of an intermixture with the Northmen. Mr. Coleridge makes this a definite argument against the Frisian hypothesis. Where, however, is the evidence that the Psalter, in respect to *place*, is Northumbrian in the way that *Rituale*, &c., are?

“The most important peculiarity in which the Durham⁶ *Evangelos* and Ritual differ from the Psalter is the form of the infinitive mood in verbs. This in the Durham books is, with the exception of one verb, *beán, esse*, invariably formed in *a*, not in *an*, the usual form in all the other Anglo-Saxon dialects. Now this is also a peculiarity of the Frisic, and of the Old Norse, and is found in no other Germanic tongue; it is then an interesting inquiry whether the one or the other of these tongues is the origin of this peculiarity; whether, in short, it belongs to the Old, the original Frisic, form which prevailed in the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, or whether it is owing to Norse influence, acting in the ninth and tenth, through the establishment of Danish invaders and a Danish dynasty in the countries north of the Humber.”—KEMBLE, *Phil. Trans.* No. 35.

§ 138. Let the Danish question be tried on its own merits. According to Mr. Garnett—speaking from information given him by a friend familiar with the MS.—the Danish words *by*=*town* or *village*, and *at*, the prefix

to the Norse infinitive (just as *to** is in English) occur once or twice in the Durham Gospels. That this is something in favour of a Danish influence is clear. On the other hand—

1. Harewood, the locality for the Rushworth glosses, is scarcely on typical Danish ground—at least as measured by the occurrence of village names in *-by*.

2. Neither is Durham—the locality, real or supposed of the Gospels and Ritual.

3. I do not say that these are very cogent objections. Still, they are objections.

§ 139. There is another fact against the forms in *-a*. The inscription of § 79 was given as I found it in such writers as quote it. It stands alone. It has two words which are Danish; but the first is a Proper Name, *Ulph*, and proves no more than such names as Thorold or Orm in the reign of Henry II.—long after the last man who spoke Danish in England had breathed his last. The other is *honom*, a truly Danish form. The inscription (as aforesaid) runs

Ulph het *áræran* for *honom* and Gunthara saula.

Ulph bid this rear for him, and Gunthar's soul.

Nevertheless, the form *áræran* is *not* Danish but Anglo-Saxon. It may be granted, however, that the inscription is a bilingual one. Be it so. It still teaches us that the change from *-an* to *-a* in the infinitive mood is not the first change effected by Danish influences. Why should it be? The Danes had no motive for effecting it. They had plenty of words ending in *-n*; *e.g.* all those ending in the postpositive article, as *mand-en*=*the man*, &c. Meanwhile, on the other hand, it is safe to say that of the two great Norse characteristics, the postpositive article, and the middle voice in *-sc*, *-st*, or

* *To* is not wholly absent in Norse.—*Saa bratte aa kvasse æ Fjellan te sjaa at*=*So steep and sharp is the rock to look at.*

-s, there is no trace whatever from Caithness to Beachy Head.

§ 140. *East-Anglian*.—The following specimen, from Thorpe's *Analecta Anglo-Saxonica*, is the will of a lady from the parts about Bury St. Edmunds :—

The original.

Ic Luba, eaðmod Godes ƿiwen, ƿas forecwedenan gôd and ƿas elmessan gesette and gefestnie ob minem erfelande et Mundlingham ƿem hiue to Cristes cirican : and ic bidde, and an Godes libgendes naman bebiade, ƿem men ƿe ƿis land and ƿis erbe hebbe et Mundlingham, ƿet he ƿas gôd forð-leste oð ƿiwalde ende. Se man se ƿis healdan wille, and lestan ƿet ic beboden hebbe an ƿisem gewrite, se him geseald and gehealden sio hiabencilice bledsung ; se his ferwerne oððe het agele, se him seald and gehealden helle-wite, bute he to fulre bote gecerran wille Gode and mannum. — *Vene ualete.*

In English.

I Luba, humble handmaid of God, settle-and fasten the aforesaid goods and alms of my heritage-in-land at Mundlingham to the sisterhood in Christ's church ; and I order, and in the name of the living God enjoin, the men who hold this land and this heritage at Mundlingham, that they hold the goods until the world's end. The man who will hold this and continue that which I have ordered in the writing, be him given and continued, the heavenly blessing. Who refuses or neglects it be to him given and continued, the pain of hell, unless he will pay the penalty in full to God and man—*Bene Valete.*

CHAPTER XXII.

PRESENT PROVINCIAL DIALECTS. — SPECIMENS FROM SOMERSETSHIRE, DEVONSHIRE, ETC., ETC.—REMARKS.

§ 141. THE complement to the study of the dialects of the Anglo-Saxon period is that of the several provincial forms of speech of the present day ; the chief questions connected with them being the following :—

1. The extent to which they show signs of influences

other than Angle. How far, for instance, is Kent Jute, Lincolnshire Danish, Cornwall Kelt, &c. ?

2. Their difference at different dates.

3. The origin of the standard, or literary, English.

In a work, however, like the present, little beyond a general indication can be attempted. Neither can anything be said about the diffusion of the English language *beyond* the boundaries of England; whether in Ireland, the New World, the Cape, India, New Holland, Tasmania, or New Zealand: in all of which localities it either comes, or has come, in contact with languages other than English.

§ 142. The more extreme forms of speech are those of the North and South; *i. e.* Devonshire and Northumberland differ from each other more than Suffolk and Hereford, or Norfolk and Shropshire. The Midland counties exhibit the *minimum* amount of peculiarities. This helps us in our classification. Whatever else they may do, the Northern, Southern, and Eastern groups cannot directly graduate into each other.

§ 143. Let the Midland dialects be called *Mercian*; those of Norfolk and Suffolk *East Anglian*; those between the Humber and Tweed *Northumbrian*; those to the south of the Thames (there or thereabouts) *Saxon*. There is nothing in this incompatible with the statement so often made, and so strongly insisted on, that the difference between the Angles and Saxons was, in all probability, only nominal. Its present application simply means the districts where the term *Saxon* prevailed; giving as a result the terms *Wes-sex*, *Es-sex*, *Sus-sex*, and *Middle-sex*.

§ 144. For the Saxon group, Somersetshire is convenient as a commencement. It gives us a strongly-marked, but not an extreme, dialect.

SOMERSETSHIRE.

Mr. Guy and the Robbers.

1.

Mr. Guy war a gennelman
O' Huntsfull, well knawn
As a grazier, a hirsch* one,
Wi' lons o' hiz awn.

Mr. Guy, a man o' veelin
Vor a ooman in distress,
Than took er up behind en ;
A cood'n do na less.

2.

A oten went ta Lunnun
Hiz cattle ver ta zill ;
All the hosses that a rawd
Niver minded hadge or hill.

A corr'd er trunk avaur en,
And by hiz belt o' leather
A bid her hawld vast ; on tha rawd,
Athout much tak, together.

3.

A war afeard o' naw one ;
A niver made hiz will ;
Like wither vawk, avaur a went
Hiz cattle ver ta zill.

10.

Not vur tha went avaur she gid
A whizzle loud an long,
Which Mr. Guy thawt very strange,
Er voice too zim'd za strong ;

4.

One time a'd bin to Lunnun,
An zawld hiz cattle well ;
A brought awa a power o' gawld,
As I've a hired tell.

11.

She'd lost er dog, she zed ; an than
Another whizz'e blaw'd,
That stortled Mr. Guy ; a stapt
Hiz hoss upon tha rawd.

5.

As late at night a rawd along,
All droo a unket ood,
A ooman rauze vrom off tha groun,
An right avaur en stood.

12.

"Goo on," zed she ; bit Mr. Guy
Zum rig beginn'd ta fear ;
Vor voices rauze upon tha wine,
An zim'd a comin near.

6.

She look'd za pitis Mr. Guy
At once hiz hoss's pace
Stapt short, a wonderin how, at
She com'd in jitch a place. [night,

13.

Again tha rawd along ; again
She whizzled, Mr. Guy
Whipt out his knife an cut tha belt,
Than push'd er off ; ver why ?

7.

A little trunk war in her hon ;
She zim'd vur gwon wi chile,
She ax'd en nif a'd take er up
And cor er a veo mile.

14.

Tha ooman he took up behine,
Begummers, war a man ;
Tha rubbers zaw ad lad ther plots
Our grazier to trepan.

So, also, *urn* = *run*, a true Anglo-Saxon, or *West-Saxon* form.

15.

I sholl not stap ta tell what zed
Tha man in ooman's clawze,
Bit he an all o'm jist behine
War what you mid suppaوزه.

18.

A lost ! why nothin—but hiz belt
A zummet moor ad gain'd ;
Thic little trunk a corr'd awa,
It gawld galore* contain'd.

16.

Tha cust, tha swaur, tha dreaten'd
An ater Mr. Guy [too,
Tha gallop'd all ; twar niver tha
Hiz hoss along did vly. [near,

19.

Nif Mr. Guy war hirsch avaur,
A now war hircher still,
Tha plunder o' tha highwamen
Hiz coffers went ta vill.

17.

Auver downs, droo dals, awa a went,
Twar da-light now amawst,
Till at an inn a stapt, at last,
Ta thenk what he'd a lost.

20.

In safety Mr. Guy rawd whim,
A oten tawld tha story ;
Ta meet wi' jitch a rig myzel,
I shood'n soce be zorry.

§ 145. To the west of the Parret the dialect approaches that of Devon—an extreme form of speech.

A DEVONSHIRE DIALOGUE.†

RAB. Zo, Bet, how is't ? How de try ?—Where hast a'be thicka way ? Where dost come from ?

BET. Gracious, Rab ! you gush'd me. I've a' be up to vicarige, to vet a book vor dame, and was looking to zee if there be any shows in en, when you wisk'd over the stile, and galled me.

RAB. And dost thee look so like a double-rose, when thee art a' galled, Bet ? What dost thee gook thee head vor : look up, wo't ?

BET. Be quiet, 'lone my hat, wol ye ?

RAB. What art tozing over the book vor ?

BET. Turning out the dog's ears.

RAB. 'Ot is it—a story-book ?

BET. I wish 'twas, I love story-books dearly ; many nearts I've a' zit up when all the volks have a' be a-bed, and a' rede till es have had a crick in the niddick, or a' burn'd my cep.

RAB. And dost love to rede stories about spirits and witches ?

BET. I'll tell thee. I was wan neart reding a story-book about spirits, that com'd and draw'd back the curtains at the bed's voot (and there was the ghastly pictures o' em). The clock had beat wan, when an owl creech'd 'pon the top o' the chimley, and made my blood rin cold. I

* This is not a provincial, but a slang, word. It is *galeor* = *enough*, and is Gaelic.

† Mrs. Gwatkin. Edition of 1839.

zim'd the cat zeed zum 'ot: the door creaked, and the wind hulder'd in the chimley like thunder. I prick'd up my ears, and presently, sum 'ot, very hurrisome, went dump! dump! dump! I would a' geed my life vor a varden. Up I sprung, drow'd down my candle, and douted en; and hadn't a blunk o' fire to teen en again. What could es do? I was afear'd to budge. At last I took heart, and went up stears backward, that nort mert catch me by the heels. I didn't unray mysel vor the neart, nor teen'd my eyes, but healed up my head in the quilt, and my heart bumpt zo, ye could hear en; and zo I lied panking till peep o' day.

RAB. Poor Bet! why if a vlen had hopp'd into thy ear thee wot a' swoon'd.

BET. You may well enew laugh at me, but I can't help et, nor vorbear reding the books when I come athort 'em.

§ 146. In Cornwall the *general* character is Devonian—in Cornwall, however, we must remember that the Cornubian form of the British was in existence during the seventeenth century.

§ 147.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

*George Ridler's Oven.**

1.

The stowns that built George Ridler's Oven,
And thaup geum from the Bleakeney's quar;
And George he wur a jolly old mon,
And his yead it graw'd above his yare.

2.

One thing of George Ridler I must commend,
And wur that not a notable theng!
He mead his brags avoore he died,
Wee any dree brothers his zons s'hou'd zeng.

3.

There's Dick the treble and John the mean,
Let every mon zing in his awn pleast,
And George he wur the elder brother,
And therevoore he would zing the beass.

4.

Mine hostess's moid (and her neaum 'twur Nell),
A pretty wench, and I lov'd her well;
I lov'd her well, good reazon why;
Because zhe lov'd my dog and I.

* From Halliwell's Archaic and Provincial Dictionary.

5.

My dog is good to catch a hen,
 A duck or goose is vood for men;
 And where good company I spy,
 O thether gwoes my dog and I.

6.

My mwother told I when I wur young,
 If I did vollow the strong beer pwoot,
 That drenk would pruv my auverdrow,
 And meauk me wear a thread-bare cwoat.

7.

My dog has gotten zitch a trick,
 To visit moids when thauy be zick;
 When thauy be zick and like to die,
 O thether gwoes my dog and I.

8.

When I have dree zispences under my thumb,
 O then I be welcome wherever I come;
 But when I have none, O then I pass by,
 'Tis poverty pearts good company.

9.

If I should die, as it may hap,
 My greauve shall be under the good yeal tap:
 In vouled earins there wool us lie,
 Cheek by jowl, my dog and I.

§ 148.

DORSETSHIRE.

*A Letter from a parish Clerk in Dorsetshire to an absent Vicar, in the Dialect of the County. From Poems on Several Occasions, formerly written by John Frec, D.D. 8vo, London, 1757.**

Measter, an't please you, I do send
 Theaz letter to you as a vriend,
 Hoping you'll pardon the inditing,
 Becaz I am not us'd to writing,
 And that you will not take unkind
 A word or zo from poor George Hind.
 For I am always in the way,
 And needs must hear what people zay.
 First of the house they make a joke,
 And zay the chimnies never smoak.
 Now the occasion of these jests,
 As I do think, were swallows' nests,

* From Halliwell's Archaic and Provincial Dictionary.

That chanced the other day to vaal
 Into the parlour, zut and aal.
 Bezide the people not a few,
 Begin to murmur much at you,
 For leaving of them in the lurch,
 And letting straingers zerve the church,
 Who are in haste to go agen;
 Zo, we ha'nt zang the Lord knows when.
 And for their preaching, I do know,
 As well as moost, 'tis but zo, zo.

For a full account of the Dorsetshire dialect, as well as for many beautiful compositions in it, see the poems of the Rev. W. Barnes.

§ 149.

WILTS.

*Old Barnzo.**

Everybody kneows owld Barnzo, as wears his yead o' one zide. One night a was coming whoame vrom market, and vell off's hos into the road, a was zo drunk. Some chaps coming by pickel un up, and zeein' his yead was al o' one zide, they thought 'twas out o' jint, and began to pull 't into 'ts pleace agen, when the owld bwoy roar'd out, "Barn zo (*born so*), I tell 'e!" Zo a' was allus called owld Barnzo ever a'terwards.

§ 150.

ISLE OF WIGHT.†

JAN. What's got there you?

WILL. A blastnashun straddlebob craalun about in the nammut bag.

JAN. Straddlebob! Where ded'st leyarn to caal'n by that neyam?

WILL. Why, what shoud e caal'n? tes the right neyam, esn ut?

JAN. Right neyam, no! why, ye gurt zote vool, casn't zee tes a dumble-dore?

WILL. I knows tes, but vur aal that straddlebob's zo right a neyam vorn as dumbledore ez.

JAN. Come, I'll be deyand if I doant laay thee a quart o' that.

WILL. Done! and I'll ax meyastur to-night when I goos whooam, beet how't wool.

WILL. I zay, Jan! I axed meyastur about that are last night.

JAN. Well! what did 'ur zay?

WILL. Why a zed one neyam ez jest zo vittum vorn as tother, and he louz a ben caald straddlebob ever zunce the island was vust meyard.

* From Akerman's Wiltshire Tales.

† From Halliwell's Archaic and Provincial Dictionary.

JAN. The devvul a hav ! if that's the keeas I spoos I lost the quart.

WILL. That thee hast, lucky ! and we'll goo down to Arverton to the Red Lion and drink un ater we done work.

§ 151.

The Hampshire graduates into the West, and the West into the East, Sussex.

SUSSEX.

*Song of Solomon.**

CHAPTER II.

1. I be de roüz of Sharon, an de lily of de valleys.
2. Lik de lily among thorns, so is my love among de dâhters.
3. Lik de appul-tree among de trees of de ood, so is my beloved among de sons. I set down under his shadder wud gurt delight, an his fruit was sweet to my taüst.
4. He brung me to de banquetin-house, an his gurt fleg over me was love.
5. Stay me wud drinkin-pots, comfort me wud appuls, for I be sick wud love.
6. His left han is under my head, an his right han clapses roun me.
7. I charge ye, O ye dâhters of Jerusalem, by de roes an by de hinds of de fil, dat ye doänt rouse up, nor wake my love tull such time as he likes.
8. De voige of my beloved ; lookee, he comes a-lippin upon de mountains, a-skipin upon de hills.
9. My love is lik a roe or a young hart ; lookee, he stans behind our wall, he looks out of de windors a-showin of hisself through de lattice.
10. My beloved spoke, an said to me : Git up, my love, my fair un, an come away.
11. For lookee, de winter is past, de rain is over an gone ;
12. De flowers show deirselves on de airth, de time for de singin of burdis is come, an de voice of de ood-pigeont is heard in our land.
13. De fig-tree puts foorth her green figs, an de vines wud de tender graüp give a good smell. Git up, my love, my fair un, an come away.
14. O my dove, dat's in de clifts of de rock, in de sacret plaüces of de stairs, let me see yer faüs, let me hear yer voice ; for sweet is yer voice an yer faüs is comely.
15. Ketch us de foxes, dem liddle foxes what spile de vines : for our vines have got tender graüps.
16. My beloved is mine, an I be he's : he feeds among de lilies.
17. Tull de dee breaks, an de shadders goo away, turn, my beloved, an be ye lik a roe or a young hart pon de mountains of Bether.

* By M. A. Lower, for the Collection of H. I. H. the Prince L. L. Bonaparte.

§ 152.

KENT.*

1.

An up we got into de boat,
 But Sal begun ta maunder,
 Fer fare de string, when we gun swing,
 Should break an come asunder.

2.

But Glover sed "It is sa tuff
 'Tud bear a dozen men ;"
 And when we thought we'd swung enough,
 He took us down again.

3.

And den he looked at me and sed,
 "It seems ta please your wife ;"
 Sal grinn'd and sed she never had
 Sudge fun in all her life.

§ 153. Middlesex, so far as the metropolis allows it to exhibit anything provincial at all, seems to go with Essex. At any rate, the confusion between *v* and *w*, which is so often laid to the charge of the Londoner, is a decided Essex characteristic.

§ 154. *The Northern—Northumbrian—Group of Dialects.*—It is safe to say that a line drawn from Warrington to Chesterfield, and from Chesterfield to Goole, gives us a limit concerning which we may predicate that everything to the north, and something to the south of it, is *Northumbrian*. Able writers, indeed, make the southern part of Yorkshire, and South Lancashire, Mercian. I think, however, that they have allowed themselves to be misled by the *political* value of the term. The extent to which certain important districts *south* of this line are also Northumbrian is another question.

The more prominent dialects of this class scarcely yield

* Dick and Sal, Dover, 1830.

to the Exmoor and West Somerset forms of speech in their departure from the ordinary English.

The divisions and sub-divisions of this group are numerous, and, in some cases, well-defined. Nevertheless, they graduate into each other.

I begin with an extreme form—one almost Scotch—viz. the Cumbrian of—

§ 155.

CUMBERLAND.

*The Impatient Lassie.**

Deuce tek the clock ! click-clackin'	O durst we lasses nobbet gang
Ay in a body's ear ; [sae	And sweetheart them we leyke,
It tells and tells the tyme is past	I'd run to thee, my Jwohnnny, lad,
When Jwohnnny sud been here.	Nor stop at dog or deyke :
Deuce tek the wheel ! 'twill nit rin	But custom's sec a silly thing—
Nae mair to-neet I'll spin, [roun,	Thur men mun lae their way,
But count each minute wid a seegh	And monie a bonny lassie sit
Till Jwohnnny he steals in.	And wish frae day to day.
How neyce the spunky fire it burns	I yence hed sweethearts monie a yen
For twee to git beseyde,	They'd weadethro' nuckandmire,
And theer's the seat where Jwhonny	And when our fwok wer deed asleep
And I forget to cheyde ; [sits—	Com' tremlin' up t' fire.
My fadder, tui, how sweet he	At Carel market lads wad stare,
snwores,	And talk, and follow me ;
My mudder's fast asleep—	Wi' feyne shwort keakes, ay frae
He prounis'd oft, but, oh ! I fear	the fair,
His word he wunnet keep.	Baith pockets cramm'd wad be.
What can it be keeps him frae me ?	O dear ! what changes women pruiue
The ways are nit sae lang,	In less than seeben year,
And sleet and snow are nought at aw	I walk the lonnins, owre the muir,
If yen were fain to gang :	But de'il a chap comes near !
Some udder lass, wi' bounnier feace,	And Jwohnnny I nee mair can trust,
Has catch'd his wicked ee,	He's just like aw the lave ;
And I'll be pointed at at kurk—	I fin' this sairy heart 'll brust
Nay, suiner let me dee !	I'll suin lig i' my grave !

* By Anderson.—*Westmorland and Cumberland Dialects*. 1839. Page 222.

But, whisht !—I hear my Jwohnnny's	Now hey for seeghs and suggest words,
Aye, that's his varra clog ! [fit—	Wi' kisses nit a few—
He steeks the faul yeat softly tui—	This warl's a parfe't paradeyse
Oh, hang that cwoley dog !	When lovers they pruiue true !

§ 156.

WESTMORLAND.

*A Song.**

Gud morrow, gossip Nan,	Spinky hes coav'd a bull,
Haw dus awe at heaam dea?	En I thout tea selt it ;
Haw dus ivvery yan,	Soo brak awt oth hull ;
Lile Dick en awe dea ?	En varra nearly kilt it.
	* * *
Tom is gaylie week,	I cannit miss this spot,
Sends his sarvis teaa ;	But mun coo et seea,
Sall hes hor her hecl,	I'd rader gang rawndth Knot,
Er wod hea cum et seea.	Then nit say haw deea.
Lile Dick hes deet his coat,	Fare yee week, dear Ann,
Wie follin widdle waddle,	As I am a sinner,
He slird in wie his foat	Clock hes strucken yan,
Intul a dirty poadle,	Fleaks toth fry for dinner.

§ 157.

SOUTH LANCASHIRE.†

The dule's i' this bonnet o' mine ;
 My ribbins 'll never be reet ;
 Here, Mally, aw'm like'to be fine,
 For Jamie'll be comin' to-neet ;
 He met me i'th' lone tother day,—
 Aw're gooin' for wayter to 'h' well,—
 An' he begged that aw'd wed him i' May ;
 Bi'th' mass, iv he'll let me, aw will.

When he took my two honds into his,
 Good Lord, heaw they trembled between ;
 An' aw darstn't look up in his face,
 Becose on him seein' my een ;
 My cheek went as red as a rose ;—
 There's never a mortal can tell
 Heaw happy aw felt ; for, thea knows,
 One couldn't ha' axed him theirsels'.

* By Mrs. Anne Wheeler.—*Westmorland and Cumberland Dialects*. 1839.

† Waugh's *Lancashire Songs*, No. 6.

But th' tale wur at th' end o' my tung,—
 To let it eawt wouldn't be reet,—
 For aw 'thought to seem forrud wur wrung ;
 So aw tow'd him aw'd tell him to-neet ;
 But, Mally, thae knows very weel,—
 Though it isn't a thing one should own,—
 If aw'd th' pikein' o'th' world to mysel',
 Aw'd oather ha' Jamie or noan.
 Neaw, Mally, aw've tow'd tho my mind ;
 What wouldto do iv 'twur thee ?
 "Aw'd tak him just while he're inclined,
 An' a farrantly bargain he'd be ;
 For Jamie's as greedly a lad
 As ever stept eawt into th' sun ;
 Go, jump at thy chance, an' get wed,
 An' may th' best o'th' job when it's done !"
 Eh, dear, but it's time to be gwon,—
 Aw shouldn't like Jamie to wait,—
 Aw connut for shame be too soon,
 An' aw wouldn't for th' world be too late ;
 Aw'm o' ov a tremble to th' heel,—
 Dost think at my bonnet'll do ?—
 "Be off, lass,—thae looks very weel ;—
 He wants noan o'th' bonnet, thae foo !"

• § 158.

CHESHIRE.*

A Day wi' the Cheshur Fox Dugs.

"Ould mon, it's welly milkin toim, where ever 'ast 'ee bin?
 Thear's slutch upo' thoi coat, oi see, and blood upo' thoi chin."
 "Oiv bin to see the gentlefolk o' Choshur roid a run ;
 Owd wench ! oiv bin a hunting, an oiv seen some rattling fun.
 "Th' owd mare was i' the smithy when the huntsman he trots through,
 Black Bill agate o' ammering the last nail in her shoe ;
 The curver laid so wheam loik, and so jovial foin the day,
 Says I, 'Owd mare, we'll tak a finging and see 'em go away.'

• • • • •
 "Tom Rance has got a single oie, wurth many another's two,
 He held his cap abuv his yed to show he'd had a view ;
 Tom's voice was loik th' owd raven's when he skroik'd out 'Tally ho !'
 For when the fox had seen Tom's feace he thought it toim to go.
 "Eh moy ! a pratty jingle then went ringin through the skoy,
 Furst Victory, then Villager begun the merry croy,

* By B. E. E. Warburton, Esq., of Arley Hall.

Then every maith was open from the oud'un to the pup,
An aw the pack together took the swellin chorus up.

"Eh moy ! a pratty skouwer then was kick'd up in the vale,
They skim'd across the funning brook, they topp'd the post an rail,
They didna stop for razzur cop, but play'd at touch an go,
An them as miss'd a footin there, lay doubled up below.

"I seed the 'ounds a crossin Farmer Flareup's boundary loin,
Whose daughter plays the peany an drinks whoit sherry woin,
Gowd rings upon her finger and silk stockings on her feet ;
Says I, 'It won't do him no harm to roid across his wheat.'

"So, toightly houdin on by th' yed, I hits th' owd mare a whop,
Hoo plumps into the middle o' the wheatfield neck an crop ;
An when hoo floinder'd out on it I catch'd another spin,
An, missis, that's the cagion o' the blood upo' my chin."

§ 159.

STAFFORDSHIRE.*

A. Dun you know solden-mouth Summy ?

B. Ees, an' a neation good feller he is tew.

A. A desput quiet mon ! but he loves a sup o' drink. Dun you know his woif ?

B. Know her, ay. Hoo's the very devil when her spirit's up.

A. Hoo is. Hoo uses that mon sheamful ; hoo rags him every neet o her loif.

B. Hoo does. Oive known her come into the public, and call him al' the names hoo could lay her tongue tew afore all the company. Hoo oughts to stay till hoo's got him i' the boat, and then hoo mit say wha hoo'd a moind. But hoo taks aifter her feyther.

A. Hew was her feyther ?

B. Whoy, singing Jemmy.

A. Oi don't think as how oi ever know'd singing Jemmy. Was he ode Soaker's brother ?

B. Ees, he was. Ho lived a top o' Hell Bouk. He was the wickedest, swearnist mon as ever I know'd. I should think as how he was the wickedest mon i' the wold, and they say he had the rheumatiz so bad.

§ 160.

DERBYSHIRE.†

A Dialogue between Farmer Bennet and Tummus Lide.

FARMER BENNET. Tummus, why dunnur yo mend meh shoon ?

TUMMUS LIDE. Becoz, mester, 'tis zo cood, I conner work wee the tachin at aw, I've brockn it ten times I'm shur to do. It freezes so

* From Halliwell's *Archaic and Provincial Dictionary*. † From Halliwell.

hard. Why Hester hung out a smock frock to dry, an in three minits it wor frozen as stiff as a poker, and I conner afford to keep a good fire; I wish I cud, I'd soon mend yore shoon, an uthers tow. I'd soon yarn sum munney, I warrant ye. Conner yo find some work for m', mester, these hard times? I'll doo onnythink to addle a penny. I con thresh, I con split wood, I con mak spars, I con thack, I con skower a dike, an I con trench tow, but it freezes zo hard. I con winner—I con fother, or milk. If there be need on't, I woodner mind drivin plow or onnythink.

FARMER B. I hanner got nothin for ye to doo, Tummus; but Mester Boord towd me jist now that they wor gooin to winner, an that they shud want sumbody to help 'em.

TUMMUS L. O, I'm glad on't, I'll run oor an zee whether I con help 'em, bur I hanner bin weein the threshold ov Mester Boord's doer for a nation time, becoz I thoot misses didner use Hester well; bur I dunner bear malice, an zo I'll goo.

§ 161.

YORKSHIRE.

(1.)

*Cleveland.**

SONG OF SOLOMON.—CHAPTER II.

1. Hah am the rose o' Sharon, and the lily of the valleys.
2. As the lily among the breers, sae is mah honey among the dowters.
3. As the apple-tree among the trees o' the wood, sae is mah beluvved among the sons. Hah sat down under his shadow wi' great deleet, an' his fruit was sweet to mah teeast.
4. He browt me to t' feasting-hoose, an' his banner ower me was luv.
5. Stay me wi' flagons, cumfort me wi' apples, for hah's seek o' luv.
6. His left hand is under mah heead, and his reet hand laps round me.
7. Hah charge ye, O ye dowters o' Jerusalem, by the roes an' by the hinds o' the field, that ye stoor nut up nor wakken mah luv till he list.
8. The voice of mah beluvved! seesthee, he comes lowpin upon the mountains, boundin ower the hills.
9. Mah beluvved is like a roe or a young hart; lothee! he stands ahint oor wall, he looks out at the windows, showing his-sel at the keeamment.
10. Mah beluvved spak, an' sed to me, Get up, mah luv, mah bonny yan, an' hine away.
11. For leukst the', the winter's neea mair, the rain is ower an' geean;
12. The flocers cum on the yerth; the time o' the singing o' birds is cum, the coo o' the cooscot is heead iv oor land.
13. The fig-tree nops wi' green fegs, and the varns wi' the tender grape gie a good saynt. Git up, mah luv, mah bonny yan, an' cow away.
14. O mah duy, that is i' the clefts o' the rock in the bye spots o' the

* From the Collection of H. I. H. the Prince L. L. Bonaparte.

stairs, let me see thah coontenance, let me hear thah voice; for thah voice is sweet, and thah coontenance weel-favor'd.

15. Tak us the foxes, the laahtle foxes that nep the varns, for oor varns hae tender grapes.

16. Mah beluvved's mine, an' hah 's his, he feeds amang the lilies.

17. Till the day leeghtens, and the gloaming flits away, turn, mah beluvved, an' be thoo like a roe or a young hart on the moontans o' Bethor.

(2.)

*Craven.**

SONG OF SOLOMON.—CHAPTER II.

1. I is 't rooaz o' Sharun, an' 't lilly o' 't gills.

2. As 't lilly amang 't wicks, evven sooa is mah luv amang 't dowghters.

3. As 't apple-tree amang 't trees o' 't wud, evven soon is mah luv amang 't sons. A sat mah daan unner as shadow wi' girt delnigh, an' as frewf wur sweet to mah teast.

4. A brought mah till 't banquetin'-heouse, an' as flag ower mah wur luv.

5. Stay mah wi' pots, comfort mah wi' apples; fur a is fair daan wi' luv.

6. As leaft han' is unner mah heead, an' as reet han' cuddles mah.

7. A charge yah, O yah dowghters o' Jerusalem, by 't roes, an' by 't hinds o' 't field, 'at yah rog nut, nother wakken mah luv till that a chews.

8. 'T voice o' mah luv! sithah, a cums lopeing upo' 't fells, skipping upo' 't hills.

9. Mah luv is laike until a roe, or a yung stag: sithah, a stanns ahint wir wa', a keeks foorth eouet o' 't winder, showin' hissel through 't casement.

10. Mah luv spak, an' sed until mah, Geet up, mah luv, mah bewty, an' cum away.

11. For, sithah, 't winter 's past, 't rain 's ower an' gon.

12. 'T flowers appear upov 't yird; 't tainae o' 't singing o' burds is cum, an' 't voice o' 't turtle 's heard i' wir lan'.

13. 'T fig-tree puts foorth her green figs, an' 't vaines wi' 't tenner graape gi' a gey good smell. Geet up, mah luv, mah bewty, an' cum away.

14. O mah duv, at is i' 't hoiles o' 't scarr, i' 't saycrit pleances o' 't staairs, leet mah see thah feeace, leet mah heear thah voice; fur sweet is thah voice, an' thah feeace is bonny.

15. Cotch us 't foxes; 't laile foxes, 'at spoil us 't vaines; fur wir vaines ha' tenner graapes.

16. Mah luv is maine, an' I is hisn: a pasters amang 't lillies.

17. Until 't day breeak, an' 't shadows flee away, toorn, mah luv, an' bee to laike until a roe or a yung stag upov 't fells o' Bethor.

(3.)

Barnsley.

LOCAL LAWS FOR PUDSA.*

Ta begin at t'furst a Jennewerry, 1856.

Noa man or up-grown lad sal be alaad ta wauk up a t'causey we beath hiz hands in hiz pockit, unless it's on a varry coud winter's day, an thay caant affoord ta bye thersenze a pair a gloves.

Two men goin airm-e-airm tagether sal be ta wauk e t'middle a t'street, for it's considerd at thay tay az much room up az a broad-wheel'd cart.

Yung men an ther sweethearts ta wauk airm-e-airm where thay like, but not ta interrupt t'free passage a uther foaks, be stoppin ta look e more than-twenty shop-windaz e wun street.

Men, goin a marketin we ther wives at t'Setterdays, a purpas ta see at thay doant cheat em, saant be alaad ; ta goa an carry ther baskit, an pick em up when they tumal, will be lawfull.

Noa cannal sal be alaad ta be snufft we t'finger an thum, or blawn aght when it's cloise ta onny boddiz faice.

Noabdy sal be alaad ta coff e t'cherch or chapil, becos thay happen ta hear sumady else do it ; if thave a coud it's lawfull. *

Foaks may hev az menny fols teeth az thay like, but fols tongues ar prohibited.

Wimmen sal be alaad ta sing ther bairns ta sleep, an at windin-wheel an wesh-tub, but not e ther huzbands' ears.

Noa womman sal be alaad whissal, az it's considerd ta be az bad az a crawin hen.

Cotton-wool sal not be alaad e t'ear ov awther man or womman, when thare e cumpany ov onnyboddy at's speikin t'truth.

(4.)

Sheffield.†

Cum all yo cutlin heroes, where'ersome yo be,
All yo wot works at flat-backs, cum lissen unto me ;

A baskitful for a shillin,

To mak em we are willin,

Or swap em for red herrins, ahr bellies tubbe‡ fillin,

Or swap em for red herrins, ahr bellies tubbe fillin.

A baskit full o' flat-backs o'm shure we'l mak, or mooar,

To ger reit into't gallara, whear we can rant an rooar,

* From *The Bairnsle Foaks Annual*. 1856.

† From A. Bywater's *Sheffield Dialect*.

‡ To be.—So, in Lincolnshire and elsewhere, *dubbut* = *do but*.

Thro' flat-backs, stooans, an sticks ;
 Red herrins, booans, an bricks ;
 If they dooant play Nansa's fansa, or onna tune we fix,
 We'l do the best at e'er we can to braik sum ore ther necks.

Hey, Jont, lad, is that thee, where are ta waddlin too ?
 Dusta work at flat-backs yit, as thahs been used to do ?

Hah, cum an tha'st gooa wimma,

An a sample o will gi'tha ;

It's won at o've just fooaged uppa Jeffra's bran new stidda ;
 Look at it well, it duz excel all't flat-backs e ahr smitha.

Let's send for a pitcher a' ale, lad, for o'm gerrin varra droi ;
 O'm ommast chooakt we smitha sleek, the woind it is so hoi.

Ge Rafe and Jer a drop,

They sen they cannot stop,

They're e sich a moita hurra to get to 't penny hop.

They're e sich a moita hurra to get to 't penny hop.

§ 162. We may now go backwards, and northwards, taking up the series where we left it, in Cumberland and Westmorland.

§ 163.

NORTHUMBERLAND.

*Song of Solomon.**

CHAPTER II.

1. Aw's the rose o' Sharon, an' the lily o' the valleys.
2. As the lily among thorns, sae is maw luiv among the dowtors.
3. As the apple-tree among the trees o' the wud, sae is maw beluived among the sons. Aw sat doon anun'er his shadow wi' greet delect, an' his fruit was sweet te maw t'yest.
4. He browt me to the bankitting-hoose, an' his banner ower me was luiv.
5. Stay me wi' flagons, cumfort me wiv apples : for aw's seek o' luiv.
6. His left hand is anun'er maw hee'd, an' his reet hand diz cuddle me.
7. Aw chairge ye, O ye dowtors o' Jeruzalum, b' the roes, an' b' the hinds o' the field, that ye stor nut up nor w'yeken maw luiv tiv he likes.
8. The voice o' maw beluived ! sees'ta, he comes lowpin' upon the moontins, skippin' ower the hills.
9. Maw beluived is like a roe, or a young hart : seesta', he stan's ahint wor wa', he luiks oot at the windis, shewing his-sel through the lattis.

* By J. G. Forster, for H. I. H. the Prince L. L. Bonaparte.—*Newcastle Dialects*.

10. Maw beluived sp'yek, an' said te me, Get up, maw luiv, my bonny yen, an' how 'way.

11. For luiksta ! the winter is past, the rain is ower an' g'yen ;

12. The fluers cum oot on the yearth ; the time o' the singin o' burds is cum, an' the cooin o' the tortle is heard i' wor land.

13. The feg-tree puts oot her green fegs, and the vines wi' the tendor grape gie a gud smell. Get up, maw luiv, maw bonny yen, an' how 'way.

14. O maw duv, that is i' the clefs o' the rock, i' the secret ply'eces o' the stairs, let me see thy coontenance, let me hear thy voice ; for thy voice is sweet, an' thy coontenance is cumly.

15. Tyek huz the foxes, the little foxes, that spoil the vines ; for wor vines hac tendor grapes.

16. Maw beluived's mine : and aw's his : he feeds among the lilies.

17. Till the day leetins, an' the shades flee away, torn, maw beluived, an' be thoo like a roe or a young hart on the moontins o' Bethor.

§ 164.

NORTH NORTHUMBERLAND.*

CHAPTER II.

1. Aw's the rose o' Sharon, an' the lily o' the valleys.

2. Like a lily mang thorns is maw luve among the dowlors.

3. Like a napple-tree mang the trees o' the wud, is maw luve among the sons. Aw sets me ways doon anunder his shador wiv a leet heart, an' his froot teastid verra nice.

4. He fetcht us intiv his feastin-hoose, an' his flag abeun us wis luve.

5. Hand u^p up wi' drinkin-cups, cumfort us wiv apples, for aw's bad o' luve.

6. His left han's anunder me heed, an' his reet hand cuddles us.

7. Nuo aw chairge ye, O ye dowlors o' Jeruz'lum, be the bucks an' the does o' the field, thit ye dinnet stor, to roose up maw luve, till he hes a mind.

8. Wheest ! it's the voice o' maw luve ! Leuk ! thondor he cums lowpin' upon the moontins, an' skurryin' ower the hills.

9. Maw troo-luve's like a buck or leish deer : assa ! he's stannin' ahint wor wa' ; he's leukin' oot o' the windors, an' showin' hissel' thro' the panes.

10. Maw troo-luve spak', he says to me, Get up, maw pet, maw canny lass, an' cum the ways ;

11. For, seenoo ; the winter's past, an' the rain's awl ower an' gean ;

12. The floers is abeun the grund ; the time for the singin' o' burds is here ; an' the chiurm o' the tortleduve is hurd i' wor country-side.

13. The feg-tree shuts oot hur green fegs, an' the vines wi' the young greaps hes a nice smell. Get up, maw pet, maw bonny lass, an' cum the ways.

* By J. P. Robson, for the Bonaparte Collection ; who is also author of the next specimen, i. e. of the Lowland Scotch, given for the sake of comparison.

14. O maw duve, that's i' the holes o' the rock, i' the hidin'-pleaces i' the steps, let's see thaw feace, let's 'hear the' talk ; for thaw voice is sweet, an' thaw feace is luvsum.

15. Get a-had o' the foxes, the weeny foxes, thit spoils wor greaps ; for wor vines hes bud weakly greaps.

16. Maw troo-luve belongs te me, an' aw tiv him ; he feeds amang the lilies.

17. Tiv sike time is the day daws, an' the cloods is a' flown, torn aboot tiv us, maw luv, an' be thoo like a buck or leish steg on the moon-tins o' Bethor.

§ 165.

LOWLAND SCOTCH.*

CHAPTER II.

1. I am the rose o' Sharon, an' the lily o' the vallies.

2. Like the lily amang thorns, sae is my love amang the lasses.

3. Like the apple-tree amang the trees of the wud, sae is my lo'ed ane amang the laddies. I sat me doon anunder his shadow wi' muckle glee, an' his fruit was swcet in my mou'.

4. He brang me til the wassail-ha', an' his banner aboon me was love.

5. Haud me up wi' stoups, mak' me glad wi' apples ; for I am forfairn wi' love.

6. His left han' is aneath my heed, an' his richt han' kiutles me.

7. I wairn ye, O ye dochters o' Jerusalem, by the raes an' the hines o' the field, that ye stirna up, nor wauken my love until his ain plesur'.

8. The voice o' my ain love ! wow, he comes loupin' upo' the moontans, skippin' upo' the hills.

9. My ain love is like til a rae or a young deer ; see ! he's stan'in' ahint oor wa' ; he keeks oot o' the windows, an' kythes at the lattis-panes.

10. My lo'ed ane spak' an' quo' he, Get up, my love, my bonnie thing, an' come awa'.

11. For, do ye no ken, the winter's awa, an' the ruin is a' ower an' gane ?

12. The flow'rs spring oot c' the grund ; the time's come for the sang 'o the birdies, an' the coo o' the cushat is heard a' ower the lan'.

13. The feg-tree pits oot her green fegs, an' the vines wi' the wee grapes gie oot a guid smell. Get up, my love, my comely ane, an' come awa' !

14. O my doo, that art in the cliffs o' the rock, in the hidin' corners o' the stairs, let me ken the sicht o' thy face, let me hear thy voice ; for thy voice is tunefu', an' thy face is winsome.

15. Tak' us the tods, the wee tods that waste the vines ; for oor vines ha'e but puly grapes.

* See note on preceding page.

16. My lo'ed ane is my ain, an' I am his : he feeds amang the lilies.
 17. Until the day daw, an' the cluds flit awa', turn til me, my lo'ed ane, an' be thou like til a rae or a young deer on the moontans o' Bether.

§ 166.

DURIAM.

*The same.**

1. A' as t' rose uv Sharon, an' t' lilley ud valleys.
2. As t' lill-y amang thowrns, sees me luv amang t' dowers.
3. As t' apple tree amang t' trees ud wood, sees me beluved amang t' sons. Ah sat doon unnonder his shaddow, wih greet deleyght, an his frewt was sweet to mee taste.
4. He browght mah tas banqueting-hoose, an his banner over mah was luv.
5. Stay mah wih flaggons ; cumfur mah wih apples : for a' seek uv luv.
6. His left kneaf's unnonder me heed, and his right kneaf duth cuddle mah.
7. Ah charge ye, O ye dowers uv Jerewsalom, be t' roes, an be to heynds ud field, at ye stur nut up, nor waken me luv, 'till he please.
8. T' voice uv me beluved ! behowld, he cumeth lowpin atoppa to moonfens, skippin atoppa t' hills.
9. Me beluved is leyke a roe or a young hart : behowld, he stands ahint our wo, he leuks furth at t' windows, shoven hissel through t' lattice.
10. Me beluved spak, an' seel tummah, Rise up, me luv, me bonnier, an cum away.
11. Fer, lo, t' winter 's past, t' rain 's ower an gaane.
12. T' flowers appear atoppa t' earth, t' time ud singin uv burds is cum, an t' voice ud turtle 's heard iv our land.
13. T' fig-tree puts furth hur green fegs, an t' veynes wud tender grape give a good smell. Arise, me luv, me bonnier, an cum away.
14. O me dove, 'ats id cleft ud rock, id secret places ud stairs, let mah see thee coontenance, let mah hear thee voice, fer sweet 's thee voice, and thee coontenance 's cumley.
15. Tak us t' foxes, t' little foxes at spoils t' veynes : fer our veynes hev tender grapes.
16. Me beluved is meyne, an a as his : he feeds amang t' lillies.
17. Until day brick, an shadows flee away, turn, me beluved, an be thah leyke a roe or a young hart atoppa t' moontens uv Bether.

§ 167. The Sheffield and Derbyshire graduate into the Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire, and the North Lincoln-

* By Thomas Moore. *As spoken at St. John's Chapel, Weardale.* Bonaparte Collection.

shire dialects. As we approach, however, the Huntingdonshire and Northamptonshire frontiers the provincial characteristics decrease; until, in the parts about Stamford, Huntingdon, and Northampton, they attain their *minimum*. Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire, so far as they depart from the comparative purity of the above-named districts, approach the West-Saxon; which in Berkshire—where we find *thick* and *thack*, for *this* and *that*, along with other peculiarities—is decidedly a member of the class of which the Somersetshire is the type. Considering, however, that the birth-place of King Alfred was in Berkshire, there is but little fear of the West-Saxon character of the dialect of that county being undervalued. It is more likely to be exaggerated; the literary West-Saxon being, in the mind of the present writer, and others, most especially referable to Somersetshire. The lines between the north-western members of the West-Saxon, the south-western members of the Northumbrian, and the western members of the Mercian, have yet to be investigated. This means that the graduation of the Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, Warwickshire, and Shropshire dialects into each other, combined with a want of materials—for the *data* for all these districts are of the scantiest—preclude us from drawing any definite lines of demarcation. On the west, the Mercian group graduates into the East-Anglian of Norfolk and Suffolk, *vid* Cambridge and the Fen districts. The East-Anglian, however, is little more than a variety of the Mercian.

§ 168. It has been stated that the extent to which provincial dialects are older or newer than the literary language cannot be expressed in general terms. Too many writers have said that they are essentially archaic. So they are sometimes. When they preserve relics of the Anglo-Saxon which the current English has

lost, they are, *pro tanto*, the older forms of speech. When, however, the current English gives such forms as *almost* and *nought but*, instead of *ommost* and *nobbut*, the provincial forms are the newer. If they often keep old words, they also give new forms.

§ 169. It has been stated that although the Northumbrian dialect of the Anglo-Saxon is in several important points more like the current English than is the West-Saxon, it is by no means safe to treat the literary English as the simple descendant of the Northumbrian. It is not this: still less is it the simple descendant of the West-Saxon; though the literary predominance of the dialect makes it look as if such were the case. Some years ago Dr. Guest corrected this notion, and drew attention to the dialects of the Midland Counties, —in which the nearest approach to the standard English is, doubtless, to be found. We must not, then, however much the Anglo-Saxon may be the mother-tongue of the current English, expect to find everything in either its West-Saxon or its Northumbrian divisions.

§ 170. The last question that arises is the extent to which our local dialects confirm or invalidate the statements of §§ 73—78 as to certain Non-Angle elements of our language. They neither invalidate nor confirm them.

Were there Jutes from Jutland in Kent? No. Lappenberg has suggested that the Danish *leding* is the Kentish *lathe*. Another explanation, however, of this word has been given.

Do they confirm the doctrine of the present writer, viz. that there were Goths from Gaul in that county? No. As far as our present information goes, there is no provincial evidence either way.

Do they confirm the notion of a Frank occupancy? No. They are neither for nor against it. The contents, however, of certain Kentish *tumuli* have been specially

compared with those of the undoubted Frank districts of the Continent, and that by writers whose researches are quite independent of those of the present writer. This, however, is a matter for the ethnologist rather than the philologue.

Is there anything either Jute or Gothic in the dialects of Hants? There is nothing either way.

Was there any *real* difference between the Angles and the Saxons? This has been answered in the negative. Do the dialects traverse the answer? It is admitted that between Anglian Norfolk and Saxon Dorsetshire there may have been a difference. But is this, necessarily, referable to the difference between Angle and Saxon? The simple difference between the Far East and the Far West accounts for it. Again—there is a difference between the Northumbrian of Angle Durham and the West-Saxon of Saxon Hants. But is this, necessarily, the difference between Angle and Saxon? The simple difference of North and South accounts for it. Test the question by the districts on the frontier. What is the difference between Saxon Essex and Angle Suffolk? between Angle Herts and Saxon Middlesex? between Saxon Berks and Mercian (Angle) Oxon? between Angle Gloucester and Saxon Wilts? Little or none. The geographical differences are real: the ethnological differences *nil*. North and South may differ, so may East and West,—it would be strange if they did not. But this is not the difference between Angle and Saxon.

§ 171. Is the term *Anglo-Saxon* unexceptionable? No. Assuming that the difference between the Saxon and the Angle is nominal, the Anglo-Saxon is simply so much English in an early form; and an able writer in the “Gentleman’s Magazine” some years back gave good reasons for treating it as such: *i. e.* as so much Old (or Oldest) English. The commonest name for it, even in the Anglo-

Saxon period, is *Englisc*. Still it is occasionally called *Angul-Saxisc*. It is rarely called *Saxonica*; still more rarely (if ever) *Saxisc*. It would be inconvenient if it were so—considering that, at the present time, the Platt-Deutsch of Germany is called *Lower Saxon*—*Nieder Sächsisch*. The suggested change, however, is inconvenient; and its inconvenience is an argument against it; *though the only one*. This is because *Old English* has a meaning already. It signifies the English immediately anterior to Chaucer; the English immediately following being *Middle English*. Meanwhile, *Semi-Saxon*, signifies the English between the time of Stephen and Henry III. This creates inconvenience. Scientific objections it neither creates nor favours. But the inconvenience is not avoided by calling the English of the Anglo-Saxon period *Angle*. The mother-tongue as spoken in Germany wants a name. For this we have the choice between *Angle* and *Anglo-Saxon*—of which the former seems the best. In the eyes of the Anglo-Saxons themselves, the Angle of the mother-country was *Old-Saxon* (*Fald-Saxisc*, or *Alt-Saxonica*). This, however, at present means the language of Westphalia rather than that of Hanover—the latter being, although Saxon, a form of speech which minute philology contrasts, rather than identifies, with the mother-tongue of the English.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE RELATION OF THE ENGLISH TO THE ANGLO-SAXON.

§ 172. THE relation of the present English to the Anglo-Saxon is that of a *modern* language to an *ancient* one: the words *modern* and *ancient* being used in a definite and technical sense. *Smiðum*, the dative plural of *smið*, is equivalent to the English *to smiths*, or to

the Latin *fabr-is*. *Smiðum*, however, is a single Anglo-Saxon word; whilst its English equivalent is a pair of words. The *-um* in *smiðum* is a part of a word. The preposition *to* is a separate word with an independent existence. *Smiðum* is the radical syllable *smið* + the subordinate inflectional syllable *-um*; the sign of the dative case. The combination *to smiths* is the substantive *smiths* + the preposition *to*, equivalent in power to the sign of a dative case, but different from it in form. As far, then, as the word just quoted is concerned, the Anglo-Saxon differs from the English by expressing an idea by a certain *modification of the form of the root*, whereas the modern English denotes the same idea by *the addition of a preposition*. *Smiðum*, however, is only one word out of many. Where the present English says *god*, the Anglo-Saxon said *god*, *gode*, *godre*, *godra*, &c., according to the Case, Gender, or Number of the Substantive with which it agreed.

§ 173. Let these *modifications of the form of the root* be called *inflections*, and the history of our language will tell us that its later stages have fewer inflections than its earlier ones. The Middle English has inflections which are wanting in the Modern, and the Early English has inflections which are wanting in the Middle. The Semi-Saxon has inflections that are wanting in the Early English, and the Anglo-Saxon has inflections which are wanting in the Semi-Saxon. The earlier the stage of the Dutch language, the fuller the inflection. The earlier the stage of the High-German, the fuller the inflection. The inflection of the Mæso-Gothic is fuller than that of any of the allied languages. The earlier the stage of the Danish, the more numerous the inflections. The earlier the stage of the Swedish, the more numerous the inflections. The earlier the stage of the Icelandic, the more numerous the inflections.

CHAPTER XXIV.

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS AND SUGGESTIONS—THE NATURE OF THEM—THE DIVISIONS OF THE GERMAN GROUP NOT CLEARLY DEFINED—ORIGINAL MAGNITUDE OF THE GERMAN AREA—THE TERM *GOTH*—SARMATIAN ELEMENTS—IN ENGLISH—IN THE NORSE LANGUAGES—EARLY DANES.

§ 174. THUS much has been written in accordance with the current views concerning the early history—the *Origines* so to say—of the English language. Except so far as they impugn the authority of Beda and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, there is little in them which opposes the doctrine of the common text-books. The authority, however, of Beda and the Chronicle being impugned, it became necessary to show reason for its being done. More than this; something had to be put in its place. The exposition of the principles upon which all this was done, along with several points of detail, in the way of philology and geography, took up many pages. Still the result—save and except the details in which it differed from the text of Beda, &c.,—was, in the main, the same as that which is given by the common authorities. The method by which it was obtained was different—and it was meant to be so; for, without disparaging results, the present writer lays much more stress upon the methods by which they are brought about. Whether right or wrong, they are always valuable as matters of intellectual discipline. This is his excuse for having spent an apparently inordinate amount of dissertation upon a very simple thesis, viz.: that the English language came from Northern Germany, and that it was *English*. What, then, has been written up to the present time is little more than an exposition of the doctrines that, without lying

exactly on the surface (inasmuch as they differ from those given by the text of Beda), lie but a little below it: doctrines which most independent investigators, more or less, agree with—some having anticipated, some adopted them. On the other hand, some prefer the older views. In saying this, however, we may add that their number decreases yearly: for it may safely be asserted that the belief in Hengist and Horsa and their congeners is dying out. However, even if it be not, there is nothing in anything which has preceded which ought to be mistaken for a paradox. The doctrine that a great many changes are *nominal* is (perhaps) opposed to the opinions of several influential writers in Germany, who believe in *real* displacements much more than does the present investigator.

§ 175. So much for what has gone before. What follows is in a different category. It is not wholly speculative: if it were so, it should find no place in an elementary work like the present. Nevertheless, it is more speculative than critical—though not without critical elements. In some places it is more ethnological than philological: but ethnology and philology are allied. Upon the whole, however, it is meant to be suggestive of further research rather than authoritative for what is already admitted. Few things, *in rerum natura*, are, at one and the same time, very true and very original; inasmuch as, when once many men are thinking on the same subject, and are moving in the right direction, there is a great deal of unconscious agreement. At the same time, the contents of the present chapter are those which (to say the least of them) their expositor holds in opposition to many with whom he is unwilling to differ.

§ 176. *Are any broad and trenchant lines of demarcation between the several divisions of the German group of languages tenable?*—If they be not, the division between the

Teutonic and the Norse branches is of small import; and Southern Danish may be much more akin to Northern Frisian, or Northern Angle, than the ordinary questions about Danish, as opposed to Angle, elements suggest. This, however, is a special detail. It is here submitted that, if German philology is to be advanced, and if we are to emancipate ourselves from the influence of names, our groups must be made according to *type* rather than according to *definition*. This means that extreme forms, along with those that approach them, can only be separated by the latter method. When we approach the confines, one class graduates into another. Low-German is easily separated from High-German, as long as we take one or two tests. But many of them are arbitrary. Now, unless we are satisfied with these, the lines between the Frank and the Saxon, like those between the Saxon and the Frisian, are indistinct. Upon the Frisian and the Norse more will be said in the sequel. At present it is enough to state that classification in the way of definition is, in many cases (I do not say in *all*, or even in the *majority*), only practicable when we take either extreme forms or single characteristics. As a single example—the Dutch of Holland and the English of England are descendants from different members of the German family; yet the Carolinian Psalms have been claimed by both Dutchmen and Saxons.

§ 177. *Original magnitude of the German area—The Goths other than German.*—Upon two points I have found reason to differ with, at any rate, the majority of inquirers; perhaps, with all of them. I find no reason to believe that the original occupancy of the Germans was at any earlier date different from what it was at the beginning of the true historical period, *i. e.* the time of the Carolingians; when the Franks were pressing upon the Saxons and the Frisians, and when an

incipient Christianity was, for the first time, supplying us with trustworthy first-hand observations. The Germans as they were found by Adam of Bremen and his contemporaries I believe to have been the Germans of the time of Tacitus. But, at the time in question, *nothing was German from the Elbe eastward. On the contrary, everything was Slavonic.* The details of this doctrine I have exhibited elsewhere.

Again—though the term *Goth* is held to be nearly synonymous with *German*, I find no evidence of any German whatever having been called, by himself or by any one else, a *Goth* until he had settled on the land of the *Getæ* or *Gothi*. If so, he was a *Goth* in the way that an Englishman is a Briton, a Spaniard a Mexican, or a Portuguese a Brazilian, *i. e.* not at all. If so, the whole early history, not only of the Goths, but of every nation whose name has been identified with *Goth* (the *Jutes*, *Gothini*, &c.), must be transferred elsewhere. The details of this view have also been given elsewhere. Elsewhere, too, have been given reasons for believing that the real Goths were *Lithuanians upon Fin soil*, *i. e.* Lithuanians in the way that a German is a Briton. If so, the term implies, in most cases, three strata of population; (1) Fin, or Ugrian, (2) Lithuanic, (3) German. If so, the Germans of Scandinavia were not the second occupants of Scandinavia, but the third; a Lithuanic and, in some cases, a Slavonic immigration having intervened between them and the earlier Fins. I believe that this doctrine is not without its adherents in Norway, Denmark, and Sweden—few though they be. This, however, is by no means incompatible with a disbelief in the so-called Fin hypothesis; by which we are taught that, before the westward movement of the so-called Indo-Europeans, *everything* in Europe, and a great deal elsewhere, was Fin, or Ugrian. It is one thing to believe, as a matter of comparatively

recent history, that the Fins of Estonia, Liefland, and Curland extended beyond the Oder, and possibly beyond the Elbe and Eyder ; another to maintain that they were the aborigines of Bohemia, Gaul, or Spain.

§ 178. *Early Sarmatians, i. e. Slavonians or (and) Lithuanians.*—Something may be said in favour of the Picts having been Sarmatians. The whole subject, however, of the Pict nationality is difficult. There is some objection to every hypothesis. Independently, however, of the Picts, I think that Slavono-Lithuanic descents upon the British islands, during the time when the Sarmatian seaboard along the Baltic extended to the Trave, are, by no means, unlikely: indeed, I hope, in a fitter treatise than the present, to give reasons for believing such to have been the case.

§ 179. *Can the Angles have been less German than their language makes them?*—Yes. In whatever way we interpret the fact upon which so much stress has been laid, viz. the extension of the Slavonic area to and beyond the Elbe, we must see the great probability of German and Slavonic intermixture. It is probable, if the Slaves pressed forward into Germania. It is probable, if the Germans encroached upon Slavonia. I would not say that the word *Angraria* may not be, like *Ingria*, *Wagria*, *Ukr-in*, *Ucker-mark*, and *Ukrain*, an actual Slavonic gloss, *march* or *boundary*. If so, all Ostphalia may, originally, have been Slave. Indeed, when we remember that Luneburg was Slavonic, it is *nearly* so from the ordinary point of view.

The Lombards' relations to the Angles have already been noticed. For believing the Lombards, or Langobards, to have been Germanized Slaves, there is, *inter alia*, the special statement of Paulus Diaconus that they were originally called *Winili* = *Wends*. Again—the nation with which the few notices of the Angles of Germany most

particularly connect them is that of the decidedly Slavonic Werini, or Varini. If this be the case, our belief in the agreement between the language of a population and its blood must be very different from that of the great upholders of what may be called the pre-eminence of the Anglo-Saxon race. To say nothing of the amount of British blood which they may have taken up in Britain, our ancestors were, even in Germany, German in language, though Ugrian and Sarmatian in blood. The same applies to the Danes and Norwegians. This, however, is a point of ethnology rather than philology.

§ 180. *Are the differential characters of the Scandinavian languages either recent or exotic?*—What is the value of the chief characteristics of the Norse languages? What are they?

1st. The neuter in *-t*, as *skön* = *pulcher*, *pulchra*, and *skön-t* = *pulchrum*: in which the Norse is distinguished from all the German forms of speech, save and except the Mæso-Gothic, where *blind-s* = *cæcus*, and *blind-ata* = *cæcum*. That this, however, is the form out of which the Modern German *-es* has been developed is shown by the O. H. G. forms *blindaz* = *blindats* (there or thereabouts). The pronouns retain the *t* throughout; but the adjectives only in Norse and Mæso-Gothic. To account for this we must suppose that the Norse became distinguished from the other German tongues before the change set in. This, however, is improbable in the eyes of those who make Mæso-Gothic High-German: which Mr. Kemble (for one) does *not*. He, especially, calls it a Low-German dialect. It might have sufficed if he had said that it was as much Low as High; as much akin to the dialects of Hanover and Westphalia as to those of Bavaria and Suabia; and I doubt whether he meant to say more. At any rate, the Mæso-Gothic is not, in the eye of every competent authority, High-German.

2nd. The pronouns of the third person in *-n*, as *ha-n* = *he*, *ho-n* = *she*. I see in this an accusative like the A. S. *hine* in the place of a nominative; the result being a sign of anything but freedom from foreign influences.

3rd and 4th. The existence of a Passive Voice, and the post-position of the article. A Dane says *kalla* = *call* = *vocare*, but *kalla-s* = *be called* = *vocari*. He also says *en sol* = *a sun*, and *ett bord* = *a table*; but *sol-en* = *the sun*, and *bord-et* = *the table*. It is scarcely possible to imagine two forms more distinctive of a language of great prominence and apparent importance than these. Let the Englishman, whose ideas have always run in the sequence *the man*, be told to reverse the order, to place *the* after *man*, and after he has done this, incorporate the two words so as to make one, and he feels like one who is told to put a cart before a horse. In reading, too, he has to acquire the habit of looking at the end of a word first. In metre the result is still more striking. A substantive of one syllable, with its corresponding definite article, gives us, in English, the measure *x a*, and helps in the construction of such lines as—

The wáy was lóng, the wínd was cold.

In the Norse the result is *a x*, and *the wáy* becomes *Veien*; *the wínd*, *Vínden*. Thus the English:—

The spring comes, the bird twitters, the wood becomes leafy, the sun laughs—

is in Swedish

Våren kommen, fågeln qvitrar, skógen löfvas, sólen ler—

and a whole series of so-called trochees is called into existence.

The Passive forms are, perhaps, less striking. They rarely, however, fail to command attention; reminding the classical scholar of such words as *vocor* and *τίπτομαι* in Latin and Greek. But a characteristic may be ex-

tremely prominent without being of any high historical value as a sign of either the antiquity or the independence of the language in which it occurs. And this is, pre-eminently, the case with the two under notice. They are just the two forms of which we know that the origin is recent, and the growth rapid. We know this in the case of the post-position of the article from the Rumanyo of Wallachia and Moldavia; where *omul* = *the man*, the *-ul* being the definite article postponed. And so it is throughout the language. Yet before A.D. 200, or the time when the Trajan conquered Dacia, there was no such form possible; inasmuch as *om* = *hom* = *man*, and *-ul* = *ille* = *the*, the *il* and *el* of the Italian and Spanish, the *le* in French—a demonstrative pronoun which in Rumanyo is post-positive, but which in both the original Latin and all the derived languages is prefixed. Judging, then, from this analogy, the Norse dialects, though they exhibited the post-positive in the eleventh and tenth centuries, may easily have been without it in the 5th, 4th, 3rd, or 2nd. At present it is common. In the Edda, however, it is rare: in the metrical portion of it (I believe) wanting altogether. Again, it is wanting in the dialect of the Duchy of Sleswick, where they say *a man*, instead of *manden*. Such are the chief reasons against overvaluing the post-position of the article in the Scandinavian dialects as a characteristic. With the Passive Voice the criticism is much the same. We know how it grew, what it grew out of, and when it grew. The *-es* in the Danish *kalles* = *vocari*, is, in Swedish, *-as*. In ordinary Icelandic it is *-ast*, and in the older Icelandic *-asc*; which, earlier still, is *-a + sik*, i. e. the *verb* + *the reflexive* pronoun. Hence, a Passive has grown out of a Middle, a Middle out of a Reflective, a Reflective out of a Verb + Pronoun—all (so to say) under our eyes and in the memory of man. Subtract, then, the post-position of the article and the so-called

Passive Voice from the Norse, or Scandinavian languages, and the result is little more than an extreme form of the Frisian.

§ 181. Both these forms, then, are new ; and it may now be added that they are both Lithuanic—*Lithuanic* being, by hypothesis, *Gothic*. In the Lithuanic, what is called the Declension of the Definite Adjective consists in the addition of the Demonstrative Pronoun *jis*, or *ji* = *hic*, or *hæc*. Thus *geras*, *zalias* = *good*, *green* ; but *geras-is*, *zalias-is* = *the good*, *the green*. As for the Middle Voice it is formed throughout by the addition of *si* or *-s* (Lat. *se*, German *sik*, *sick*, *sig*) to the Active.

§ 182. *Early Danes*.—The statement of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle that, A.D. 793, certain Danes invaded England, is, doubtless, true. The statement that they were the first who did so is one of those negative assertions which are quite as likely to be wrong as right. It has been said by many to be wrong ; in other words, the date of the first Danish invasion is uncertain. If, however, one name be more Danish than another, it is the name of the town of *Grimsby* ; which is not only treated as Danish by the modern philologue, but is one of the names especially claimed for Scandinavia by so old and so native a writer as Snorro, in whose work a well-known passage runs thus :—

Northumberland is called the fifth part of England. Eric had his residence in York, where Lodbrok's sons, it is said, had formerly been ; and Northumberlaud was principally inhabited by Northmen. Since Lodbrok's sons had taken the country, Danes and Northmen often plundered there, when the power of the land was out of their hands. Many names of places in the country are Norwegian ; as *Grimsby*, *Haukylot*, and many others.—*Laing's Translation*, vol. i. pp. 316, 317.

In local legends of this ancient town the name of Havclok, the Dane, is conspicuous. I am not prepared to say that the connection is real. Still, as it exists, it commands notice. I have given reasons for believing

that, word for word, *Havelok* is *Higelac*, the name of an Angle hero in *Beowulf*—an Angle hero who has a great deal to do with certain Danes. In Norse, the name is *Hugleikr* and *Huhlek*; in Latin *Chocilaichus*—*Chocilaichus* being a real historical character, a Scandinavian who, according to Gregory of Tours, descended on the coast of Holland, and was killed in the parts along the river Niers, A. D. 515. That, so far as the Angle *Higelac* has a basis in real history, he is the Norse *Chocilaichus*, has been long and generally admitted. The present writer, who (carrying the identification further) sees in his name the word *Havelok* as well, finds, in him, a Scandinavian corsair, the historical part of whose actions find their venue in Holland, whilst the legendary portion of them appertains to Grimsby on the opposite coast. The date of his death, be it remembered, is both historical and early, *i. e.* A. D. 515, long anterior to the date of the Danish invasions as given in the Saxon Chronicle.

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

SOUNDS—SPEAKING AND SPELLING.

§ 183. IN speaking, we represent our ideas and thoughts by means of *words*, which words are composed of certain elementary sounds. In the word *go* there are two such; in the word *got*, three; and so on. As long as we limit ourselves to speaking, these elementary sounds are all that require notice. They address themselves to the *ear*. They are capable, however, of being represented by certain signs called *letters*, by which we are enabled not only to speak but to *write*. Letters address themselves to the *eye*. In the word *go* the letter *g* is the sign of its first, the letter *o* the sign of its second, sound. But all languages were spoken long before they were written; and, at the present moment, there are numerous forms of speech which have never been reduced to writing at all. Hence, letters come later than the sounds they express. But as a picture never exactly represents the object from which it is taken, so the spelling of a language never exactly represents the speaking; in other words, there is always some difference between language as it is sounded and language as it is written. Sometimes there are more sounds than letters. Sometimes words change their pronunciation as they pass from one people

or from one generation to another, whilst no corresponding change is made in the manner of writing them. Sometimes fresh sounds from other languages are introduced; and, as no fresh letters are brought to represent them, they must be represented, as they best may, by the letters already in use. In the English language we have amongst others the following modes of spelling wherein the eye has a tendency to mislead the ear.

The sounds of *ph* and of *f*, in *Philip* and *fillip*, differ to the eye, but to the ear are identical. Here a difference is simulated.

The sounds of *th* in *thin*, and *th* in *thine*, differ to the ear; but to the eye they seem the same. Here a difference is concealed.

Furthermore, these last sounds appear to the eye to be double or compound. This is not the case; they are simple single sounds, and not the sounds of *t* followed by *h*, as the spelling leads us to imagine.

§ 184. Besides improper modes of spelling, there is another way of concealing the true nature of sounds. If I say that *ka* and *ga* are allied, the alliance is manifest; since I compare the actual *sounds*. If I say *ka* and *gee* are allied, the alliance is concealed; since I compare, not the actual sounds, but only the *names of the letters* that express those sounds. Now in the English language we have, amongst others, the following names of letters that have a tendency to mislead:—

The sounds *fa* and *va* are allied. The names *eff* and *vee* conceal this alliance.

The sounds *sa* and *za* are allied. The names *ess* and *zed* conceal the alliance. Hence, in comparing sounds, it is advisable to have nothing to do either with letters or names of letters, but to *compare the sounds themselves*.

§ 185. *Sounds and syllables*.—In many cases it is sufficient, in comparing consonants, to compare *syllables*

that contain those consonants. Thus, in order to determine the relations of *p*, *b*, *f*, or *v*, we say *pa*, *ba*, *fa*, or *va*; or for those of *s* and *z*, we say *sa*, *za*. Here we compare *syllables*, each consonant being followed by a vowel. But, at times, this is insufficient. We are often obliged to isolate the consonant from its vowel, and bring our organs to utter the imperfect sounds of *p'*, *b'*, *t'*, *d'*.

§ 186. With these preliminaries let us consider some of the properties of the articulate sounds. Let any of the *vowels* (for instance the *a* in *father*) be sounded. The lips, the tongue, and the parts within the throat remain in the same position; and as long as these remain in the same position the sound is that of the vowel under consideration. Let, however, a change take place in the position of the organs of sound; let, for instance, the lips be closed, or the tongue be applied to the front part of the mouth. In that case the vowel sound is cut short. It undergoes a change. It terminates in a sound that is different, according to the state of those organs whereof the position has been changed. If, on the vowel in question, the lips be closed, there arises an imperfect sound of *b* or *p*. If, on the other hand, the tongue be applied to the front teeth or to the fore part of the palate, the sound is one of *t* or *d*. This fact illustrates the difference between the vowels and the consonants. It is a further condition, in the formation of a vowel sound, that the passage of the breath be *uninterrupted*. In the sound of the *l* in *lo* (isolated from its vowel) the sound is as continuous as is that of the *a* in *fate*. Between the consonant *l* and the vowel *a*, however, there is this difference: with *a* the passage of the breath is uninterrupted; with *l*, the tongue is applied to the palate, breaking or arresting the passage of the breath.

§ 187. The primary division, then, of our articulate sounds is into *vowels* and *consonants*. The latter are

again divided into *liquids* (*l, m, n, r*) and *mutes* (*p, b, f, v, t, d, k, g, s, z, &c.*)

§ 188. *Sonant and surd*.—Take the sounds of *p, f, t, k*, and *s*. Isolate them from their vowels, and pronounce them. The sound is the sound of a *whisper*. Let *b, v, d, k, z*, be similarly treated. The sound is no whisper, but one at the natural tone of our voice. Now, *p, f, t, k, s*, are *surd*, whilst *b, v, &c.*, are *sonant*. Instead of *surd*, some say *hard*, and instead of *sonant*, some say *sharp*. The terms *sonant* and *surd* are, in a scientific point of view, the least exceptionable. They have, however, the disadvantage of being somewhat pedantic.

§ 189. *Continuous and explosive*.—Isolate the sounds of *b, p, t, d, k, g*. Pronounce them. You have no power of prolonging the sounds, or of resting upon them. They escape with the breath, and they escape at once. It is not so with *f, v, sh, zh*. Here the breath is transmitted by degrees, and the sound can be drawn out and prolonged for an indefinite space of time. Now, *b, p, t, &c.*, are *explosive*, *f, v, &c.*, *continuous*.

§ 190. Concerning the vowels, we may predicate that they are all *continuous*, and that they are all *sonant*. Concerning the liquids, we may predicate that they are all *continuous*, and that they are all *sonant*. Concerning the mutes, we may predicate that one-half of them is *surd*, and the other half *sonant*, and that some are *continuous*, and that others are *explosive*.

§ 191. The letter *h* is no *articulate* sound, but only a breathing.

§ 192. *The system of Mutes*.—The system of the consonants more especially commands our attention—the *Mutes* commanding it most.

The *th* in *thin* is a simple single sound, different from the *th* in *thine*. It may be expressed by the sign *p*.

The *th* in *thine* is a simple single sound, different from the *th* in *thin*. It may be expressed by the sign *ð*.

The *sh* in *shine* is a simple single sound, and it may be expressed by the sign σ^* (Greek $\sigma\iota\gamma\mu\alpha$).

The *z* in *azure*, *glazier* (French *j*), is a simple single sound, and it may be expressed by the sign ξ (Greek $\xi\eta\tau\alpha$).

In the Lap, and, probably, in many other languages, there are two peculiar sounds, different from any in English, German, and French, &c. They may respectively be expressed by the sign κ and the sign γ (Greek $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\pi\pi\alpha$ and $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\alpha$).

§ 193. With these preliminary notices we may exhibit the system of the sixteen mutes; having previously prepared ourselves for two fresh terms, and bearing in mind what was said concerning the words *surd* and *sonant*, *continuous* and *explosive*.

From the sound of *p* in *pat*, the sound of *f* in *fat* differs in a certain degree. This difference, however, is not owing to a difference in their sonancy. Each is *surd*. Neither is it owing to a difference in their continuity or explosiveness; although *f* is continuous, whilst *p* is explosive. This we may ascertain by considering the position of *s*. The sound of *s* is *continuous*; yet *s*, in respect to the difference under consideration, is classed not with *f* the continuous sound, but with *p* the explosive one. What is this difference? At present it is enough to say that it exists, and that—

As <i>f</i> is to <i>p</i>	so is <i>v</i> to <i>b</i> .
— <i>v</i> — <i>b</i>	— <i>p</i> — <i>t</i> .
— <i>p</i> — <i>t</i>	— ξ — <i>d</i> .
— ξ — <i>d</i>	— κ — <i>k</i> .
— κ — <i>k</i>	— γ — <i>g</i> .
— γ — <i>g</i>	— σ — <i>s</i> .
— σ — <i>s</i>	— ζ — <i>z</i> .

§ 194. *Y* and *w*.—These sounds, respectively inter-

* This by no means implies that such was the power of σ , ξ , γ , κ , in Greek. They are merely convenient symbols.

mediate to *γ* and *i* (the *ee* in *feet*), and to *v* and *u* (*oo* in *book*), form a transition from the vowels to the consonants.

§ 195. The French word *roi*, and the English words *oil*, *house*, are specimens of a fresh class of articulations; viz. of *compound vowel* sounds or diphthongs. The diphthong *oi* is the vowel *o* + the semivowel *y*. The diphthongal sound in *roi* is the vowel *o* + the semivowel *w*. In *roi* the semivowel element precedes, in *oil* it follows. The diphthongs in English are four; *ou* as in *house*, *ew* as in *new*, *oi* as in *oil*, *i* as in *bite*, *fight*. They all follow.

§ 196. *Chest, jest*.—Here we have *compound consonantal* sounds. The *ch* in *chest* = *t* + *sh*; the *j* in *jest* = *d* + *zh*.

§ 197. *The sound of ng*.—The sound of the *ng* in *sing*, *king*, *throng*, when at the end of a word, or of *singer*, *ringing*, &c., in the middle of one, is not the natural sound of the combination *n* and *g*, each letter retaining its natural power and sound; but a simple single sound, for which the combination *ng* is a conventional mode of expression.

§ 198. *Certain combinations of articulate sounds are incapable of being pronounced*.—The following rule is one that, in the forthcoming pages, will frequently be referred to:—*Two mutes of different degrees of sonancy are incapable of coming together in the same syllable*. For instance, *b*, *v*, *d*, *g*, *z*, &c., being sonant, and *p*, *f*, *t*, *k*, *s*, &c., being surd, such combinations as *abt*, *avt*, *apd*, *afd*, *agt*, *akd*, *atz*, *ads*, &c., are unpronounceable. *Spelt*, indeed, they may be; but all attempts at *pronunciation* end in a *change* of the combination. In this case either the sonant letter is really changed to its surd equivalent (*b* to *p*, *d* to *t*, &c.) or *vice versa* (*p* to *b*, *t* to *d*). The combinations *abt*, *agt*, in order to be pronounced, must become either *apt* or *abd*, or else *akt* or *agd*.

§ 199. *Unstable combinations*.—That certain sounds in combination with others have a tendency to undergo further changes, may be collected from the observation of our own language, as we find it spoken by those around us, or by ourselves. The diphthong *ew* is a sample of what may be called an unsteady or *unstable* combination. There is a natural tendency to change it either into *oo* or *yoo*; perhaps also into *yew*. Hence *new* is sometimes sounded *noo*, sometimes *nyoo*, and sometimes *nyew*.

§ 200. *Effect of the semivowel y on certain letters when they precede it*.—Taken by itself the semivowel *y*, followed by a vowel (*ya, yee, yo, you, &c.*), forms a stable combination. Not so, however, if it be preceded by a consonant of the series *t* or *s*, as *tya, tyo*; *dya, dyo*; *sya, syo*. There then arises an *unstable* one. *Sya* and *syo* we pronounce as *sha* and *sho*; *tya* and *tyo* we pronounce as *cha* and *jo* (*i. e. tsh, dzh*). This we may verify from our pronunciation of words like *sure, picture, verdure* (*shoor, pictshoor, verdzhoor*), having previously remarked that the *u* in those words is not sounded as *oo* but as *yoo*. The effect of the semivowel *y*, taken with the instability of the combination *ew*, accounts for the tendency to pronounce *dew* as if written *jew*.

§ 201. *Double consonants rare*.—It cannot be too clearly understood that, in words like *pitted, stabbing, massy, &c.*, there is no real reduplication of the sounds of *t, b, and s*, respectively. Between the words *pitted* (as with the small-pox) and *pitied* (as being an object of pity) there is difference in spelling only. In speech the words are identical. *The reduplication of the consonant is, in English and many other languages, a conventional mode of expressing in writing the shortness of the vowel preceding.* As to real reduplications of consonants, *i. e.* reduplications of their *sound*, they are, in all languages, extremely rare. In English they occur only under one

condition. In *compound* and *derived* words, where the original root *ends*, and the superadded affix *begins*, with the same letter, there is a reduplication of the sound *and not otherwise*. In the following words, all of which are compounds, we have true specimens of the double consonant.

n is doubled in *unnatural*, *innate*, *oneness*.

l — *soulless*, *civil-list*, *palely*.

k — *book-case*.

t — *seaport-town*.

It must not, however, be concealed, that, in the mouths even of correct speakers, one of the double sounds is often dropped.

§ 202. *Combinations of a consonant and h*.—The criticism applied to words like *pitted*, &c., applies also to words like *Philip*, *thin*, *thine*, &c. There is therein no sound of *h*. In our own language the *true* aspirates, like the true reduplications, are found only in compound words; and there they are often slurred in the pronunciation.

We find *p* and *h* in the words *haphazard*, *upholder*.

b and *h* — *abhorrent*, *cow-hunting*.

f and *h* — *knife-handle*, *off-hand*.

v and *h* — *stare-head*.

d and *h* — *adhesive*, *childhood*.

t and *h* — *nuthook*.

th and *h* — *withhold*.

k and *h* — *inkhorn*, *bakehouse*.

g and *h* — *gig-horse*.

s and *h* — *race-horse*, *falsehood*.

z and *h* — *exhibit*, *exhort*.

r and *h* — *perhaps*.

l and *h* — *wellhead*, *foolhardy*.

m and *h* — *Amherst*.

n and *h* — *unhinge*, *inherent*, *unhappy*.

§ 203. Whatever may be the prevalence of the term *aspirate*, as applied to sounds of *f*, *v*, *th*, *ah*, *sh*, and *zh*, the term itself is exceptionable. Its opposite is *lene*. In the language where the names originated, viz. the Greek,

the words were ψίλον and δασύ: the Latin for which are *lenis* and *asper*, and the English *mild* and *rough*. Neither is the compound *exasperate* unknown to us. For all this, the current name for the opposite of *lene* is *aspirate* = *endowed with a breathing*. The origin of the confusion is clear. The single sounds which the Greeks called δασύ and expressed by a single sign (θ, φ, χ), the Latins expressed by *t*, *p*, and *c*, + the *aspirate h*. At the present time, the words are too much alike for both to be conveniently retained. Supposing, however, that we keep them, their respective meanings are plain. The *asperates* are the opposites to the *lenes*: the *aspirates* being the *th*, *ph*, and *kh*, in *nu-thook*, *ha-phazard*, and *in-khorn*. How the *asperates* differ from their corresponding *lenes* has not yet been determined. That it is *not* by the addition of *h* is evident. *Ph* and *th* are conventional modes of spelling simple single sounds, which might better be expressed by simple single signs.*

CHAPTER II.

ON QUANTITY AND ACCENT.

§ 204. *Quantity*.—Certain vowels, like the *a* in *fat*, *i* in *fit*, *u* in *but*, and *o* in *not*, have the character of being uttered with rapidity, so that they pass quickly in the enunciation, the voice not resting on them. This rapidity of utterance becomes more evident when we contrast with

* In a valuable paper in the *Philological Transactions*, written before the present remarks were penned, though not before the conviction of the impropriety of the word *aspirate* had become familiar to the present writer, Professor Key commits himself to the same view. It may, then, be considered that his high and independent authority is in favour of a change in the use of the two terms.

them the prolonged sounds of the *a* in *fate*, *ee* in *feet*, *oo* in *book*, or *o* in *note*; wherein the utterance is retarded, and wherein the voice rests, delays, or is prolonged.

Let the *n* and the *t* of *not* be each as 1, the *o* also being as 1; then each letter, consonant or vowel, shall constitute $\frac{1}{3}$ of the whole word.

Let, however, the *n* and the *t* of *not* be each as 1, the *o* being as 2. Then instead of each consonant constituting $\frac{1}{3}$ of the whole word, it shall constitute but $\frac{1}{4}$.

Upon the comparative extent to which the voice is prolonged, the division of vowels and syllables into *long* and *short* has been established: the *o* in *note* being long, the *o* in *not* being short. The longness or shortness of a vowel or syllable is said to be its *quantity*.

§ 205. Attention is directed to the word *vowel*. The longness or shortness of a *vowel* is one thing; the longness or shortness of a *syllable* another. The vowel in *see* is long; and long it remains, whether it stands as it is, or is followed by a consonant, as in *see-n*, or by a vowel, as in *see-ing*. The vowel in *sit* is short. If followed by a vowel it becomes unpronounceable, except as the *ea* in *seat*. By a consonant, however, it *may* be followed. Such is the case in the word quoted—*sit*. Followed by a *second* consonant, it still retains its shortness, *e. g.* *sits*. Now, whatever the comparative length of the *syllables*, *see* and *seen*, *sit* and *sits*, may be, the length of their respective *vowels* is the same.

§ 206. If we determine the character of the syllable by the character of the vowel, all syllables are short wherein there is a short vowel, and all are long wherein there is a long one. Hence, measured by the quantity of the vowel, the word *sits* is short, and the syllable *see- in seeing* is long.

But it is well known that this view is not the ordinary view. It is well known that, in the eyes of a classical

scholar, the *ee* in *seeing* is short, and that in *sits* the *i* is long. The Classic differs from the Englishman thus,—*He measures his quantity, not by the length of the vowel, but by the length of the syllable taken altogether.* The perception of this distinction enables us to comprehend the following statements.

(a) That vowels long by nature may *appear* to become short by position, and *vice versâ*.

(b) That, by the laxity of language, the *vowel* may be said to have changed its quantity, whilst it is the *syllable* alone that has been altered.

(c) That if one person measure his quantities by the vowels, and another by the syllables, what is short to the one, shall be long to the other, and *vice versâ*.

(d) That one of the most essential differences between the English and the classical languages is, that the quantities of the first are measured by the vowel, those of the latter by the syllable. To a Roman, the word *monument* consists of two short syllables and one long one; to an Englishman it contains three short syllables.

§ 207. *Accent*.—In the word *tyrant* there is an emphasis, or stress, upon the first syllable. In the word *presume* there is an emphasis, or stress, on the second syllable. This emphasis, or stress, is called *accent*. The circumstance of a syllable bearing an accent is sometimes expressed by a mark (´); in which case the word is said to be accentuated, *i. e.* to have the accent signified in writing.—(1) Words accented on the last syllable.—*Brigáde, preténce, harpoón, relíeve, detér, assúme, besóught, beréft, befóre, abroád, abóde, abstrúse, intermíx, superádd, cavalíer*.—(2) Words accented on the last syllable but one.—*An'chor, ar'gue, hásten, fáther, fóxes, smíting, húsband, márkét, vápóur, bárefóot, archángel, bespátter, disábile, terrífic*.—(3) Words accented on the last syllable but two.—*Reg'u-lar, an'tidote, for'tify, suscéptible, incon-*

trovéritable.—(4) Words accented on the last syllable but three (rare). *Réceptacle, régulating, tálkativeness, ábsolutely, lúminary, inévitable, &c.*

§ 208. *Emphasis*.—In *týrant* and *presúme*, we deal with single words; and in each *word* we determine which *syllable* is accented.

In the line,

Better for *us* perhaps, it might appear,—
POPE.

the pronoun *us* is strongly brought forward. An especial stress or emphasis is laid upon it, denoting that *there are other beings to whom it might not appear, &c.* This is collected from the context. Here there is a *logical* accent, or *emphasis*.

CHAPTER III.

ORTHÖEPEY AND ORTHOGRAPHY.

§ 209. ORTHÖEPEY, a word derived from the Greek *orthos* (*upright*), and *epos* (*a word*), signifies the right utterance of words. Orthöepý determines words, and deals with a language as it is *spoken*; *orthography* determines the correct spelling of words, and deals with a language as it is *written*. This latter term is derived from the Greek words *orthos* (*upright*), and *graphé* (*writing*). Orthography is less essential to language than orthöepý; since all languages are spoken, whilst but a few languages are written. Orthography presupposes orthöepý. Orthography addresses itself to the eye, orthöepý to the ear. Orthöepý deals with the articulate sounds that constitute syllables and words; orthography treats of the signs by which such articulate sounds are expressed in writing. A *letter* is a *sign* of a *sound*.

§ 210. *Principles of a perfect orthography.*—A full and perfect system of orthography consists in two things:—

1. The possession of a sufficient and consistent alphabet.
2. The right application of such an alphabet.

§ 211. First in respect to a sufficient and consistent alphabet. Let there be, in a certain language, simple single articulate sounds, to the number of forty, whilst the simple single signs, or letters, expressive of them, amount to no more than *thirty*. In this case the alphabet is insufficient. It is not full enough: since ten of the simple single articulate sounds have no corresponding signs whereby they may be expressed. An alphabet, however, may be sufficient, and yet imperfect. It may err on the score of *inconsistency*. Let there be in a given language two simple single sounds, such as the *p* in *pate*, and the *f* in *fate*. Let these sounds stand in a given relation to each other. Let a given sign, for instance **Ɔ** (as is actually the case in Hebrew), stand for the *p* in *pate*; and let a second sign be required for the *f* in *fate*. Concerning the nature of this latter sign, two views may be taken. One framer of the alphabet, perceiving that the two sounds are mere modifications of each other, may argue that no new sign is at all necessary, but that the sound of *f* in *fate* may be expressed by a mere modification of the sign **Ɔ**, and may be written thus **Ɔ**, or thus **Ɔ'** or **Ɔ'**, &c., upon the principle that like sounds should be expressed by like signs. The other, contemplating the difference between the two sounds, rather than the likeness, may propose, not a mere modification of the sign **Ɔ**, but a letter altogether new, such as *f*, or *φ*, &c., upon the principle that sounds of a given degree of dissimilitude should be expressed by corresponding signs. In this stage of the inquiry, the expression of the sounds in point is a matter of convenience only. No question has been raised as to

its consistency or inconsistency. But this begins under conditions like the following:—Let there be in the language in point the sounds of the *t* in *tin*, and of the *th* in *thin*; which are precisely in the same relation to each other as the *p* in *pate* and the *f* in *fate*. Let each of these sounds have a sign, or letter, expressive of it. Upon the nature of these signs or letters will depend the nature of the sign or letter required for the *f* in *fate*. If the letter expressing the *th* in *thin* be a mere modification of the letter expressing the *t* in *tin*, then must the letter expressive of the *f* in *fate* be a mere modification of the letter expressing the *p* in *pate*, and *vice versa*. If this be not the case, the alphabet is inconsistent.

In the English alphabet we have the following inconsistencies:—The sound of the *f* in *fate*, in a certain relation to the sound of the *p* in *pate*, is expressed by a totally distinct sign; whereas, the sound of the *th* in *thin* (similarly related to the *t* in *tin*) is expressed by no new sign, but by a mere modification of *t*; viz. *th*.

§ 212. A third element in the faultiness of an alphabet is the fault of *erroneous representation*. The best illustration of this we get from the Hebrew alphabet, where the sounds of א and ב, mere *varieties* of each other, are represented by distinct and dissimilar signs, whilst א and ב, sounds *specifically* distinct, are expressed by a mere modification of the same sign, or letter.

§ 213. *The right application of an alphabet*.—An alphabet may be both sufficient and consistent, accurate in its representation of the alliances between articulate sounds, and in no wise redundant; and yet, withal, it may be so wrongly applied as to be defective. Of defect in the use or application of the letters of an alphabet, the three main causes are the following:—

(a) *Unsteadiness in the power of letters*.—Of this there

are two kinds. In the first, there is one sound with two (or more) ways of expressing it. Such is the sound of the letter *f* in English. In words of Anglo-Saxon origin it is represented by a simple single sign, as in *fill*; whilst in Greek words it is denoted by a combination, as in *Philip*. The reverse of this takes place with the letter *g*; where a single sign has a double power. In *gibbet* it is sounded as *j*, and in *gibberish* as *g* in *got*.

(b) *The aim at secondary objects.*—The natural aim of orthography, of spelling, or of writing, is to express the *sounds* of a language. Syllables and words it takes as they meet the ear, translates them by appropriate signs, and so paints them, as it were, to the eye. That this is the natural and primary object is self-evident; but beyond this natural and primary object there is, with the orthographical systems of most languages, a secondary one, *viz.* the attempt to combine with the representation of the sound of a given word, the representation of its history and origin. Thus—the sound of the *c*, in *city*, is the sound that we naturally represent by the letter *s*, and if the expression of this sound were the *only* object of our orthographists, the word would be spelt accordingly (*sity*). The following facts, however, traverse this simple view of the matter. The word is a derived word. It is transplanted into our own language from the Latin, where it is spelt with a *c* (*civitas*). To change this *c* into *s* conceals the origin and history of the word. For this reason the *c* is retained in our alphabet, although, as far as the mere expression of sounds is concerned, it is a superfluity. In cases like the one adduced, the orthography is bent to a secondary end, and is traversed by the etymology.

(c) *Obsolescence.*—It is very evident that modes of spelling which at one time may have been correct, may, by a change of pronunciation, become incorrect; so that

orthography becomes obsolete whenever there takes place a change of speech without a correspondent change of spelling.

§ 214. From the foregoing remarks we arrive at the theory of a full and perfect alphabet and orthography, of which a few (amongst many others) of the chief conditions are as follow:—

1. That for every simple single sound, incapable of being represented by a combination of letters, there be a simple single sign.

2. That sounds within a determined degree of likeness be represented by signs within a determined degree of likeness; whilst sounds beyond a certain degree of likeness be represented by distinct and different signs, *and that uniformly.*

3. That no sound have more than one sign to express it.

4. That no sign express more than one sound.

5. That the primary aim of orthography be to express the sounds of words, and not their histories.

6. That changes of speech be followed by corresponding changes of spelling.

§ 215. With these preliminaries we may proceed to detail. The *vowels* belonging to the English language are the following *twelve*:—

1. That of *a* in *father*.

2. — *a* — *fit*.

3. — *a* — *fate*.

4. — *aw* — *bawl*.

5. — *o* — *not*.

6. — *o* — *note*.

7. That of *e* in *bed*.

8. — *i* — *pit*.

9. — *ee* — *feet*.

10. — *u* — *bull*.

11. — *oo* — *fool*.

12. — *u* — *duck*.

The *diphthongal* sounds are *four*.

1. That of *ou* in *house*.

2. — *ew* — *new*.

3. — *oi* — *oil*.

4. — *i* — *bite*

This last sound is most incorrectly expressed by the single letter *i*.

The *consonantal* sounds are (1) two *semivowels*; (2) four *liquids*; (3) fourteen *mutes*; (4) *ch* in *chest*, and *j* in *jest*, compound *sibilants*; (5) *ng* as in *king*; (6) the aspirate *h*. In all, twenty-four.

1. <i>w</i>	as in	<i>wet</i> .	18. <i>th</i>	as in	<i>thin</i> .
2. <i>y</i>	—	<i>yet</i> .	14. <i>th</i>	—	<i>thine</i> .
3. <i>m</i>	—	<i>man</i> .	15. <i>g</i>	—	<i>gun</i> .
4. <i>n</i>	—	<i>not</i> .	16. <i>k</i>	—	<i>kind</i> .
5. <i>l</i>	—	<i>let</i> .	17. <i>s</i>	—	<i>sin</i> .
6. <i>r</i>	—	<i>run</i> .	18. <i>z</i>	—	<i>zeal</i> .
7. <i>p</i>	—	<i>pate</i> .	19. <i>sh</i>	—	<i>shine</i> .
8. <i>b</i>	—	<i>ban</i> .	20. <i>z</i>	—	<i>azure, glazier</i> .
9. <i>f</i>	—	<i>fan</i> .	21. <i>ch</i>	—	<i>chest</i> .
10. <i>v</i>	—	<i>van</i> .	22. <i>j</i>	—	<i>jest</i> .
11. <i>t</i>	—	<i>tin</i> .	23. <i>ng</i>	—	<i>king</i> .
12. <i>d</i>	—	<i>din</i> .	24. <i>h</i>	—	<i>hot</i> .

§ 216. The vowels being twelve, the diphthongs four, and the consonantal sounds twenty-four, we have altogether as many as forty sounds, some being so closely allied as to be mere modifications of each other, and others being combinations rather than simple sounds; all, however, agreeing in requiring to be expressed by letters or by combinations of letters, and to be distinguished from each other. This enables us to appreciate our alphabet's—

Insufficiency—(a) *In respect to the vowels*.—Notwithstanding the fact that the sounds of the *a* in *father*, *fate*, and *fat*, and of the *o* and the *aw* in *note*, *not*, and *bawl*, are modifications of *a* and *o* respectively, we have, still, six vowel sounds specifically distinct, for which (*y* being a consonant rather than a vowel) we have but five signs. The *u* in *duck*, specifically distinct from the *u* in *bull*, has no specifically distinct sign to represent it. (b) *In respect to the consonants*.—The *th* in *thin*, the *th* in *thine*, the *sh* in *shine*, the *z* in *azure*, and the *ng* in *king*,

five sounds specifically distinct, and five sounds perfectly simple, require corresponding signs, which they have not.

Inconsistency.—The *f* in *fan* and the *v* in *van*, sounds in a certain degree of relationship to *p* and *b*, are expressed by signs as unlike as *f* is unlike *p*, and as *v* is unlike *b*. The sounds of the *th* in *thin*, the *th* in *thine*, the *sh* in *shine*, similarly related to *t*, *d*, and *s*, are expressed by signs as like *t*, *d*, and *s*, respectively, as *th* and *sh*. The compound sibilant sound of *j* in *jest* is spelt with the single sign *j*, whilst the compound sibilant sound in *chest* is spelt with the combination *ch*.

Erroneousness.—(a) The sound of the *ee* in *feet* is considered the long sound of the *e* in *bed*; whereas it is the long sound of the *i* in *pit*. (b) The *i* in *bite* is considered as the long sound of the *i* in *pit*; whereas it is a diphthongal sound. (c) The *u* in *duck* is looked upon as a modification of the *u* in *bull*; whereas it is a specifically distinct sound. (d) The *ou* in *house* and the *oi* in *oil* are looked upon as the compounds of *o* and *i* and of *o* and *u* respectively; whereas the latter element of them is not *i* and *u*, but *y* and *w*. (e) The *th* in *thin* and the *th* in *thine* are dealt with as one and the same sound; whereas they are sounds specifically distinct. (f) The *ch* in *chest* is dealt with as a modification of *c* (either with the power of *k* or of *s*); whereas its elements are *t* and *sh*.

Redundancy.—(a) As far as the representation of sounds is concerned, the letter *c* is superfluous. In words like *citizen* it may be replaced by *s*; in words like *cat* by *k*. In *ch* as in *chest*, it has no proper place. In *ch* as in *mechanical*, it may be replaced by *k*. (b) The compendium *q* is superfluous; *cw* or *kw* being its equivalent. (c) The compendium *x* also is superfluous; *ks*, *gz*, or *z* being equivalent to it. (d) The diph-

thongal forms *æ* and *œ*, as in *Æneas* and *Cræsus*, except in the way of etymology, are superfluous and redundant.

Unsteadiness.—Here we have—(1) the consonant *c* with the double power of *s* and *k*; (2) *g* with its sound in *gun*, and also with its sound in *gin*; (3) *x* with its sounds in *Alexander*, *apoplexy*, *Xenophon*.

In the foregoing examples a single sign has a double power; in the words *Philip* and *fillip*, &c., a single sound has a double sign.

§ 217. *On certain conventional modes of spelling.*—In the Greek language the sounds of *o* in *not* and of *o* in *note* (although allied) are expressed by the unlike signs (or letters) *o* and *ω*, respectively. In most other languages the difference between the sounds is considered too slight to require for its expression signs so distinct and dissimilar. In some languages the difference is neglected altogether. In many, however, it is expressed, and that by some modification of the original letter. All these are orthographic expedients in which the English language abounds. Thus—

(a) The reduplication of a vowel, as in *feet*, *cool*, is an orthographic expedient. It merely means that the syllable is *long*. The juxtaposition of two different vowels, as in *plain*, *moan*, generally means the same.

(b) The addition of the *e* mute, as in *plane*, *whale* (whatever may have been its origin), is, at present, but an orthographic expedient. It denotes the lengthening of the syllable.

(c) The reduplication of the consonant after a vowel, as in *spotted*, *torrent*, is in most cases but an orthographic expedient. It merely denotes that the preceding vowel is *short*.

§ 218. *Historical Sketch of the English Alphabet.*—It is, chiefly, by the *history* of an alphabet, that its defects are accounted for.

With few, if any exceptions, *all the modes of writing*

in the world originate, directly or indirectly, from the Phœnician, and, at a certain period, the alphabet of Phœnicia consisted of *twenty-two* separate and distinct letters.

§ 219. In this state it was imported into *Greece*. Now, as it rarely happens that any two languages have precisely the same elementary articulate sounds, so it rarely happens that an alphabet can be transplanted from one tongue to another, and be found to suit. When such is the case, alterations are required. The extent to which these alterations are made at all, or (if made) made on a right principle, varies with different languages. Some *adapt* an introduced alphabet well: others badly. The Greeks adapted the Phœnician alphabet *well*, or, at any rate, tolerably.

§ 220. The *Roman* alphabet was *not* taken *directly* from the Phœnician. Nor yet was it taken, *in the first instance*, from the Greek. It had a *double* origin. It was Old Italian and Etruscan in the first instance, Greek afterwards. The Roman alphabet expressed the language to which it was applied tolerably—not well. Thus—

(a) It is a matter of regret, that the difference which the Greeks drew between the so-called *long* and *short e* and *o*, was neglected by the Latins; in other words, that *ω* was omitted entirely, and *η* changed in power.

(b) It is a matter of regret, that such an unnecessary *compendium* as *q = cu*, or *cw*, should have been retained, and, still more so, that the equally superfluous *x = cs*, or *ks*, should have been re-admitted.

(c) It is a matter of regret, that the Greek *θ*, although expressive of a simple sound, became *th*. This was a combination rather than a letter; and the error which it engendered was great. It suggested the idea, that a simple sound was a compound one—which was wrong. It further suggested the idea, that the sound of *θ* differed from that of *τ* by the addition of *h*—which was wrong also.

§ 221. The *Anglo-Saxon* had, even in its earliest stage, the following sounds, for which the Latin alphabet had no equivalent signs or letters.

1. The sound of the *th* in *thin*.
2. The sound of the *th* in *thine*.

It had certainly these: probably others.

Expressive of these, two new signs were introduced, viz. þ = *th* in *thin*, and ð = *th* in *thine*.

W, also, evolved out of *u*, was either an original improvement of the Anglo-Saxon orthographists, or a mode of expression borrowed from one of the allied languages of the Continent.

§ 222. This was, as far as it went, correct, so that the Anglo-Saxon alphabet, although not originally meant to express a German tongue at all, answered the purpose to which it was applied tolerably. Change, however, went on; and the orthography which suited the earlier Anglo-Saxon, would not suit the later; at any rate, it would not suit the language which had become, or was becoming, *English*. During the Anglo-Norman period, the signs þ and ð became obsolete; the sounds which they represented being foreign to the French language. Other French details crept in; orthographical expedients became common. Add this to the want of uniformity amongst copyists, the original insufficiency of our alphabet, and the acknowledged faultiness of our orthography is, to a great extent, accounted for, the English being, at the present time, the worst spelt language in the world. There are reasons for its being so: but this is another question.

PART III.

PROSODY.

§ 223. *Metre*.—Metre, in English, is the result of the recurrence, at certain intervals, of accented syllables.

In—

Then fáre thee wéll, mine ówn dear lóve,
The wórld hath nów for ús
No gréater griéf, nor páin alóve
The páin of pártíng thús—

every second, in—

At the clóse of the dáy, when the hámlet is stíll,
And the mórtals the sweéts of forgétfulness próve,
And when nóught but the tórrént is héárd on the híll,
And there's nóught but the níghtíngale's sóng in the gróve—

every third, syllable is accented.

§ 224. *Dissyllabic measures*.—For an accented syllable write *a*, for an unaccented one *x*. Hence—

The wáy was lóng, the wínd was cóld,
runs—

$x \acute{a} \ x \acute{a} \ x \acute{a} \ x \acute{a}$,

where *x* coincides with *the*, *a* with *way*, &c.

Measure the length of the line in question. Measure it by the *syllables*, and it consists of eight; by the *accents*, and it consists of four. In the latter case you take the accented syllable with its corresponding unaccented one, and group the two together. A group of syllables thus taken together is called a *measure*.

§ 225. *Analysis of a pair of Rhyming syllables.*—Let the syllables *told* and *bold* be taken to pieces. They consist of three parts or elements: 1, the vowel (*o*); 2, the parts *preceding* the vowel (*t* and *b* respectively); 3, the parts *following* the vowel (*ld*). Now for two words to fully, truly, and perfectly rhyme to each other, it is necessary—(1) That the vowel be the *same* in both; (2) that the parts following the vowel be the *same*; (3) that the parts preceding the vowel be *different*. Beyond this the syllables should be accented. *Sky* and *lie* form good rhymes, but *sky* and the *ly* in *merrily* bad ones.

§ 226. *Imperfect Rhymes.*—*None* and *own* are better rhymes than *none* and *man*; because there are degrees in the amount to which sounds differ from one another. In like manner *breathe* and *teeth* are nearer to rhymes than *breathe* and *teal*.

In matters of rhyme the letter *h*, being no articulate sound, counts as nothing. *High* and *I*, *hair* and *air*, are imperfect rhymes:

3 Whose generous children narrow'd not their *hearts*
 With commerce, giv'n alone to arms and *arts*.

Words where the letters coincide, but the sounds differ, are only rhymes to the eye. *Breathe* and *beneath* are in this predicament; so also are *cease* and *ease* (*eaze*).

In the fat age of pleasure, wealth, and *ease*,
Sprang the rank weed, and thrived with large *increase*.

§ 227. *Single Rhymes.*—An accented syllable standing by itself, constitutes a single rhyme.

'Tis hard to say if greater want of *skill*
Appear in writing or in judging *ill*.

§ 228. *Double Rhymes.*—An accented syllable followed by an unaccented one, constitutes a double rhyme.

The meeting points the sacred hair *dissever*
From her fair head for ever and for *ever*.

§ 229. *Treble Rhymes*.—An accented syllable followed by two unaccented ones, constitutes a treble rhyme.

Beware that its fatal *ascendancy*
Do not tempt thee to mope and repine;
With a humble and hopeful *dependancy*
Still await the good pleasure divine.
Success in a higher *bedtitude*,
Is the end of what's under the Pole;
A philosopher takes it with *grátitude*,
And believes it the best on the whole.

§ 230. *Blank Metres*.—Accent is essential to English metre. Rhyme, on the other hand, is only an ornament. Metres where there is no rhyme are called Blank Metres.

Of man's first disobedience and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world and all our woe,
With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,
Sing, Heavenly Muse!—MILTON.

§ 231. *The Measures*.—The English measures are as follows :

- | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------------|
| 1. <i>a x</i> .— <i>týrant, sílly</i> , | } Dissyllabic. | <i>Spender - a a</i> |
| 2. <i>x a</i> .— <i>presúme, detér</i> , | | |
| 3. <i>a x x</i> .— <i>mérrily, fúrtify</i> , | } Trisyllabic. | |
| 4. <i>x a x</i> .— <i>disáble, preférring</i> , | | |
| 5. <i>x x a</i> .— <i>refugée, cavalíér</i> , | | |

§ 232. *Last Measure indifferent*.—The last measure of a line is indifferent as to its length. In the verses of § 228 the original character of the measure is *x a* throughout, until we get to the words *disséver* and *for éver*. Here, at the first view, it seems *x a* is converted into *x a x*. A different view, however, is the more correct one. *Disséver* and *for éver* are rather *x a* with a syllable over. This extra syllable may be expressed by the sign *plus* (+), so that the words in point may be expressed by *x a +*, rather than by *x a x*. A measure, whereof the last

syllable is accented, can only vary from its original character on the side of excess; that is, it can only be altered by the *addition* of fresh syllables. With the measures $a x$, $a x x$, $x a x$, the case is different. Here a syllable or syllables may be subtracted.

Queen and huntress, chaste and fair,
 Now the sun is laid to sleep,
 Seated in thy silver chair,
 State in wouted splendour keep.
 Hesperus invokes thy light,
 Goddess, exquisitely bright.

The formula for expressing *fair*, *sleep*, *chair*, &c., is not a , but rather $a x$ followed by the *minus* sign ($-$), or $a x -$.

§ 233. *Metrical Notation*.—By using the sign \times we may write $x a \times 4$, or $x a \times 5$, instead of $x a, x a, x a, x a$, and $x a, x a, x a, x a, x a$, in full. If so, lines like—

Rich the treasure,
 Sweet the pleasure,

and

Tumult cease,
 Sink to peace—

are $a x \times 2$, and $a x \times 2 -$, respectively.

§ 234. *Chief English Metres*.—The chief metres in English are of the formula $x a$.

1. *Gay's Stanza*.—Lines of three measures, $x a$, with alternate rhymes; the odd ones being double.

^x ^a ^x ^a ^x ^a ^x ^a
 'Twas when the seas were roaring
 With hollow blasts of wind,
 A damsel lay deploring
 All on a rock reclined.

2. *Common octosyllabics*.—Four measures, $x a$, with rhyme, and (unless the rhymes be double) eight syllables (*octo syllabæ*).—Butler's *Hudibras*, Scott's *Poems*, The *Giaour*, and other poems of Lord Byron.

3. *Elegiac octosyllabics*.—Same as the last, except that the rhymes are regularly alternate, and the verses arranged in stanzas.

And on her lover's arm she leant,
 And round her waist she felt it fold,
 And far across the hills they went,
 In that new world which now is old :
 Across the hills and far away,
 Beyond their utmost purple rim,
 And deep into the dying day
 The happy princess followed him.

TENNYSON.

4. *Octosyllabic triplets*.—Three rhymes in succession. Generally arranged as stanzas.

I blest them, and they wander'd on ;
 I spoke, but answer came there none :
 The dull and bitter voice was gone.

TENNYSON.

5. *Blank verse*.—Five measures, *x a*, without rhyme.—Paradise Lost, Young's Night Thoughts, Cowper's Task.

6. *Heroic couplets*.—Five measures, *x a*, with pairs of rhymes.—Chaucer, Denham, Dryden, Waller, Pope, Goldsmith, Cowper, Byron, Moore, Shelley, &c. This is the common metre for narrative, didactic, and descriptive poetry.

7. *Heroic triplets*.—Five measures, *x a*. Three rhymes in succession. Arranged in stanzas.

8. *Elegiacs*.—Five measures, *x a* ; with regularly alternate rhymes, and arranged in stanzas.

The curfew tolls the knell of parting day,
 The lowing herds wind slowly o'er the lea,
 The ploughman homewards plods his weary way,
 And leaves the world to darkness and to me.

GRAY.

9. *Rhymes royal*.—Seven lines of heroics, with the last two rhymes in succession, and the first five recurring at intervals.

This Troilus, in gift of curtesie,
 With hawk on hond, and with a huge rout
 Of knightes, rode, and did her company,
 Passing all through the valley far about ;
 And further would have ridden out of doubt.
 Full faine and woe was him to gone so sone,
 But turn he must, and it was eke to doen.

CHAUCER.

10. *Ottava rima*.—A metre with an Italian name, and borrowed from Italy, where it is used generally for narrative poetry. Eight lines of heroics, the first six rhyming alternately, the last two in succession.

Arrived there, a prodigious noise he hears,
 Which suddenly along the forest spread ;
 Whereat from out his quiver he prepares
 An arrow for his bow, and lifts his head ;
 And, lo ! a monstrous herd of swine appears,
 And onward rushes with tempestuous tread,
 And to the fountain's brink precisely pours,
 So that the giant's joined by all the boars.

Morgante Maggiore (LD. BYRON'S Translation).

11. *Terza rima*.—Borrowed both in name and nature from the Italian.

The Spirit of the fervent days of old,
 When Words were things that came to pass, and Thought
 Flash'd o'er the future, bidding men behold
 Their children's children's doom already brought
 Forth from the abyss of Time which is to be,
 The chaos of events where lie half-wrought
 Shapes that must undergo mortality :
 What the great seers of Israel wore within,
 That Spirit was on them and is on me ;
 And if, Cassandra-like, amidst the din
 Of conflicts none will hear, or hearing heed
 This voice from out the wilderness, the sin
 Bè theirs, and my own feelings be my meed,
 The only guerdon I have ever known.

12. *Alexandrines*.—Six measures, *x a*, generally (perhaps always) with rhyme.

13. *Spenserian stanza*.—Eight lines of the formula *x a x 5*, followed by an Alexandrine.

It hath been through all ages ever seen,
 That with the prize of arms and chivalrie
 The prize of beauty still hath joined been,
 And that for reason's special privitie ;
 For either doth on other much rely.
 For he meseems most fit the fair to serve
 That can her best defend from villanie ;
 And she most fit his service doth deserve,
 That fairest is, and from her faith will never swerve.

SPENSER.

14. *Service Metre*.—Couplets of seven measures. This is the Common Metre of the Psalm versions. It is also called Common Measure, or Long Measure. In this metre there is always a pause after the fourth measure, and many grammarians consider that with that pause the line ends. According to this view, the Service Metre does not consist of two long lines with seven measures each ; but of four short ones, with four and three measures each alternately. The Psalm versions are printed so as to exhibit this pause or break.

The Lord descended from above, | and bow'd the heavens most high,
 And underneath his feet He cast | the darkness of the sky.
 On Cherubs and on Seraphim | full royally He rode,
 And on the wings of mighty winds | came flying all abroad.

STERNHOLD AND HOPKINS.

In this matter the following rule is convenient. When the last syllable of the fourth measure in the one verse *rhymes* with the corresponding syllable in the other, the long verse should be looked upon as broken up into two short ones ; in other words, the couplets should be dealt with as a stanza. Where there is no rhyme except at the seventh measure, the verse should remain undivided. Thus :—

Turn, gentle hermit of the glen, | and guide thy lonely way
 To where yon taper cheers the vale | with hospitable ray—

constitutes a single couplet of two lines, the number of thymes being two. But,

Turn, gentle hermit of the dale,
 And guide thy lonely way
 To where yon taper cheers the vale
 With hospitable ray.—GOLDSMITH.

constitutes a stanza of four lines, the number of rhymes being four.

15. *Ballad Stanza*.—Service metre broken up in the way just indicated.—Goldsmith's Edwin and Angelina, &c., from which the last stanza was an extract.

16. *Poulterer's Measure*.—Alexandrines and Service Metre alternately.

§ 235. *Licences*.—It rarely happens that, even in the most regular metres, the same measure is exclusively adhered to throughout. Instead of

There comes the squall more black than night,
 Before the Adrian gale—

the author writes

There comes the squall *blacker* than night,
 Before the Adrian gale.—MACAULAY.

substituting *a x* for *x a*, and giving variety to his verse.

Again, in the following line from Marlow, we find *a x* in the place of *x a*.

Tyrants swim safest in a purple flood.

§ 236. *Symmetrical Metres*.—Allowing for the indifference of the last measure, the syllables in all the lines hitherto quoted have been a multiple of the accents, and the verses have been symmetrical.

§ 237. *Unsymmetrical Metre*.—Lines, where the syllables are *not* a multiple of the accents, may be called unsymmetrical.

In the yéar since Jésus diéd for mén,
 Eighteen hundred yéars and tén,
 Wé were a gáilant cómpañý,
 Ríding o'er lánd and sáiling o'er sée.
 O'h ! but wé went mérrilý !

We fórded the river, and clómb the high hll,
 Néver our steéds for a dáy stood stíll.
 Whéther we láy in the cáve or the shéd,
 Our sleép fell sóft on the hárdést béd ;
 Whéther we cóuch'd on our róugh capóte,
 Or the róughér plánk of our glíding bóat ;
 Or strétch'd on the beách or our sáddles spréad
 As a pillow beneáth the résting héad,
 Frésh we wóke upón the mórrów.
 A'll our thóughts and wólds had scópe,
 Wé had héalth and wé had hópe,
 Tóil and trável, bút no sórrów.

These are naturally trisyllabic. Where they are symmetrical they are so by accident. A metrical fiction, that conveniently illustrates their structure, is the doctrine that they are *lines formed upon measure x a x, for which either x x a or a x x may be substituted, and from which either a x or x a may be formed by ejection of either the first or last unaccented syllable.*

§ 238. *Convertible Metres.*—Such a line as

Ere her faithless sons betray'd her

may be read in two ways. We may either lay full stress upon the word *ere*, and read

E're her faithless sóns betráy'd her ;

or we may lay little or no stress upon either *ere* or *her*, reserving the full accentuation for the syllable *faith-* in *faithless*, in which case the reading would be

Ere her fáithless sóns betráy'd her.

Lines of this sort may be called examples of *convertible metres*, since by changing the accent a dissyllabic line may be converted into one partially trisyllabic, and *vice versâ*.

This property of convertibility is explained by the fact of accentuation being a *relative quality*. In the example before us *ere* is sufficiently strongly accented to stand in contrast to *her*, but it is not sufficiently strongly accented

to stand upon a par with the *faith-* in *faithless* if decidedly pronounced.

§ 239. *Metrical and grammatical combinations.*—The syllables *ere her faith-* form a *metrical*, the syllables *her faithless sons*, a *grammatical*, combination. When the syllables contained in the same measure are also contained in the same construction, the metrical and the grammatical combinations coincide. Such is the case with the line

Remémber | the glóries | of Brian | the bráve ;

where the same division separates both the measure and the subdivisions of the sense ; inasmuch as the word *the* is connected with the word *glories* equally in grammar and in metre, in syntax and in prosody. So is *of* with *Brian*, and *the* with *brave*. The coincidence or non-coincidence between the metrical and grammatical combinations may be called *Rhythm*.

§ 240. *Alliteration of the Anglo-Saxon metres.*—In Anglo-Saxon, the metres were, what is called, Alliterative, i. e. a certain number of accented initial syllables, within the space of either a single line or a couplet, began with the same letter : the vowels passing for identical. This system was not only Anglo-Saxon, but Norse as well, and, in a less degree, German also.

SPECIMENS.*

1.

ANGLO-SAXON.

OPENING OF BEOWULF.

Hwæt we Gár-Dena,
in gear-dagum,
þeód-cýninga,
þrým ge-frunon—
hú ða Aþelingas
ellen fremedon—

Lo ! we of-the-Gar-Denes
In the days-of-yore,
Of the people-kings,
Glory have-heard—
How the Athelings
Strength promoted—

* The Italics denote the alliterations.

oft *Scyld Scefing*,
sceapen(a) *bræatum*,
monegum mægþum,
meodo-setla of-teáh—
egsode eorl—
syððan æ’rest wearð
feá-sceaft funden ;
 he þæs *frófre ge-bá(d)*,
weóx under wolcnum,
weorð-mýndum þáh ;
oð þæt him æ’g-hwýlo
þára ymb-sittendra,
ofer hron-ráde,
hýran scolde,
gombaŋ gýldan—
þæt wæ’s góð cyning—
þæm eafra wæ’s
æfter cenned,
geong in geardum,
þone Góð sende
folce to frófre ;
fýren-pearfe on-geat,
þæt hie æ’r drugon,
aldor-(le)áse.
Lange hwile,
him þæs lif-freá,
wuldres wealdend,
worold-are for-geaf.
Deo-wulf wæ’s breme,
blæ’d wide sprang,
Scýldes eafra,
Scede-landum in.

Of *Scyld Scefing*
 Of enemies to-the-hosts,
 To many nations,
 The mead-settles off-drove—
 The earl terrified—
 Since erst was
 Fee-ship found—
 He for this prosperous bided,
 Waxed under welkin,
 With worth-memorials throve,
 Till him each
 Of the around-sitters,
 Over the whale-road,
 Hear should,
 Tribute pay—
 That was good king—
 To him after-comer was
 After begotten,
 Young in homestead,
 Him God sent
 Folk to comfort ;
 Friend’s service understood
 That they erst drew
 Generation-less,
 Long while,
 Him thereof life-lord
 Glory’s wealder,
 World-honour gave.
 Beowulf was brim (*famous*),
 Prosperity wide sprang,
 Scyld’s after-comer,
 Scedeland in.

2.

OLD NORSE.

FROM THE EDDA.

Völuspá, stanzas 1—6.

1.

Hljóðs bið ek allar
helgar kindir,
meiri ok minni,
mögu Heimdallar :

1.

Silence bid I
 Holy children,
 Great and small,
 Tribe of Heimdall ;

vildu at ek Valföðrs
 vél framtelja?
 fornsþjöll fíra,
 þau er ek fremst um man.

Wilt thou that I Valfader's
 Weal forth-tell?
 Fore-spells of men,
 They (*whom*) I first mind.

2.

Ek man jötna
 ár um borna,
 þá er forðum
 mik fœdda höfðu;
 niu man ek heima,
 níu íviðjur,
 mjötvið mæran
 fyr mold neðan.

2.

I mind of Yotuns
 Years ago born,
 They (*who*) fore-times
 Me fed have:
 Nine mind I homes,
 Nine * * *
 The mid-wood great,
 Before the mould nether.

3.

A'r var alda
 þar er Ymir bygði,
 vara sandr né sær
 né svalar unnir,
 jörð fannsk æva
 né upphiminn,
 gap var ginnunga,
 en gras hvergi.

3.

Yore was of ages
 Then when Ymer built,
 Was (*nor*) sand nor sea,
 Nor cool waters;
 Earth found-its-self never,
 Nor up-heaven,
 Gaping was yawning,
 And grass nowhere.

4.

A'ðr Burs synir
 bjóðum um yðu,
 þeir er miðgarð
 mæran skópu:
 sól skein sunnan
 á salar steina;
 þá var grund groin
 grœnum lauki.

4.

Ere Bur's sons
 * * * * *
 They who mid-earth,
 Great shaped:
 Sun shone south
 On halls of stone;
 Then was ground growing
 With green leeks (*plants*).

5.

Sól varp sunnan
 sinni mána,
 hendi inni hægrí
 um himinjóðýr;
 sól þat ne vissi
 hvar hon sali átti,

5.

Sun cast south,
 Fellow of moon,
 Hand in left
 About heaven's beasts;
 Sun that ne wist
 Where she hall owned;

mani þat ne vissi
 hvat hann megins átti-
 stjörnur þat ne vissu
 hvar þær staði áttu.

Moon that ne wist
 What she fellows owned.
 Stars that ne wist
 Where theysted (*place*) owned.

6.

Dá géngu regin öll
 á rökstóla,
 ginuheilög Goð,
 ok um þat gættusk:
 nótt ok niðjum
 niöfn um gáfu,
 morgin hétu
 ok miðjan dag,
 undorn ok aptan,
 árum at telja.

6.

Then ganged rulers all
 To ric-stools,
 Thoroughly-holy Gods,
 And about that consulted ;
 Night and * * *,
 Names gave they.
 Morning hight they (*called*),
 And mid day,
 Undorn (*noon*), and afton,
 Years to tell.

§ 241. The Norse languages give us not only numerous specimens of alliterative poetry, but also the rules of its prosody. These are, perhaps, more artificial than actual practice requires. They are also more stringent and elaborate than those of the Anglo-Saxons.

Thus, the alliterative syllables take names, one being the *head-stave* and the other two the *by-staves*.

The *head-stave* has its place at the beginning of the second line, or (if we throw the two in one) immediately after a break, *cæsura*, pause, or division.

The *by-staves* belong to the first line out of two, or to the first member of a single one.

An unaccented syllable at the beginning of the second line (or member) counts as nothing.

Again, the vowels which collectively are dealt with as a single letter not only *may*, but *must*, be different. This goes far to enable anything and everything to be metre—inasmuch as all that is wanted to constitute either one long or two short lines is the occurrence of three words beginning with a vowel, and accented on their initial

syllable. The following is from Thorlakson's Translation of *Paradise Lost* :—

Um fyrsta manns
felda hlýðni
ok átlýsting
af epli forboðna,
hvaðan óvægr
upp kom dauði,
Edens missir,
ok allt höl manna ;
Þartil annarr einn,
ærði maðr,
aptr fær
oss víðreista,
ok afrekar nýan
oss til handa
fullsælustað
fögrum sigri ;

Sýng þú, Menta-
móðir himneska !
þú sem Hórebs fyrr
á huldum toppi,
eða Sínai,
sauðaverði
innblést fræðanda
útvalit sæði,
hve alheimr skópst
af alls samblandi ;
Eða lysti þik
lángtum heldr
at Zíons hæð
ok Sílóa brunni,
sem framstreymdi
hjá Frétt guðligri, &c.

Of Man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,
Sing, heavenly Muse, that on the secret top
Of Oreb, or of Sinai, didst inspire
That shepherd, who first taught the chosen seed,
In the beginning how the Heavens and Earth
Rose out of Chaos : or if Sion's hill
Delight thee more, and Siloa's brook that flow'd
Fast by the oracle of God, &c.

§ 242. *Constant and inconstant parts of a rhyme.*—Of the three parts, or elements, of a rhyme, the vowel and the part which follows the vowel are *constant* ; the part which precedes being *inconstant*. Hence—

(1.) In two or more syllables that rhyme with each other, neither the vowel nor the sounds which *follow* it can be *different*.

(2.) In two or more syllables that rhyme with each other, the sounds which *precede* the vowel cannot be *alike*.

Now the number of sounds which can precede a vowel is limited. It is that of the consonants and consonantal combinations; of which a list can be made *à priori*.

<i>p</i>	<i>pl</i>	<i>pr</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>bl</i>	<i>br</i>
<i>f</i>	<i>fl</i>	<i>fr</i>	<i>v</i>	<i>vl</i>	<i>vr</i>
<i>t</i>	<i>tl</i>	<i>tr</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>dl</i>	<i>dr</i>
<i>th</i>	<i>thl</i>	<i>thr</i>	<i>dh</i>	<i>dhl</i>	<i>dhr</i>
<i>k</i>	<i>kl</i>	<i>kr</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>gl</i>	<i>gr</i>
<i>s</i>	<i>sp</i>	<i>sf</i>	<i>st</i>	<i>sth,</i>	<i>&c.</i>

and so on.

§ 243. This gives us the following method (or receipt) for the discovery of rhymes:—

1. Divide the word to which a rhyme is required, into its *constant* and *inconstant* elements.

2. Make up the inconstant element by the different consonants and consonantal combinations until they are exhausted.

3. In the list of words so formed, mark off those which have an existence in the language. These will all rhyme with each other; and if the list of combinations be exhaustive, there are no other words which will do so.

Thus, from the word *told*, separate the *o* and *-ld*, which are constant.

Instead of the inconstant element *t*, write successively *p*, *pl*, *pr*, *b*, *bl*, *br*, &c.: so that you have the following list:—*t-old*, *p-old*, *pl-old*, *pr-old*, *b-old*, *bl-old*, *br-old*, &c. Of these, the words like *plold*, *blold*, and *brold*, that have no existence in the language, are possible, although not actual, rhymes.

§ 244. All words have the same number of *possible*, but not the same number of *actual* rhymes. Thus, *silver* is a word amenable to the same process as *told*; yet *silver* is a word without a corresponding rhyme. This is because the combinations which answer to it (*pilver*, *plilver*,

prilver, bilger, &c.) do not constitute words, or combinations of words in the English language.

§ 245. *Assonances*.—Approximate rhymes, wherein the vowels only, or the consonants only, or vowels and consonants, coincide, are called *assonances*. In the Spanish and Scandinavian literature assonant metres are important, numerous, and prominent.

The following is assonant—Irish, however, rather than English:—

O the groves of Blarney
They are so charming,
All by the purling of soft silent brooks;
With banks of roses,
That spontaneous grow there,
All standing in order by the sweet rock close.

§ 246. *English metres and classical*.—English metres are based upon *Accent*, classical upon *Quantity*. By treating an accented syllable as the equivalent to a long, and an unaccented syllable as the equivalent to a short one, we get a loose kind of analogy, which, from the fact of its having been, to some extent recognized, requires notice. Subject to this view, the metrical notation for—

The wáy was lóng, the wínd was cóld—
Mérrily, mérrily, sháll I live nów—

would be, not—

x a, x a, x a, x a,
a x x, a x x, a x x, a

respectively, but—

˘ - ˘ - ˘ - ˘ -
˘ ˘ - ˘ ˘ - ˘ ˘

Again—

As they splash in the blood of the slippery street,
is not—

but—
x x a, x x a, x x a, x x a,
˘ ˘ - ˘ ˘ - ˘ ˘ - ˘ ˘ -

With this view, there is a certain number of classical *feet* with their syllables affected in the way of *quantity*, to which there are equivalent English *measures* with their syllables affected in the way of *accent*. Thus if the formula

— —	be a classical,	the formula	<i>a x</i>	is an English	<i>trochee</i> .
— —	„	„	<i>x a</i>	„	<i>iambus</i> .
— — —	„	„	<i>a x x</i>	„	<i>dactyle</i> .
— — —	„	„	<i>x a x</i>	„	<i>amphibrachys</i> .
— — —	„	„	<i>x x a</i>	„	<i>anapæst</i> .

And so on in respect to the larger groups of similarly affected syllables which constitute whole lines and stanzas; verses like

Cóme to séeK for fáme and glóry—
 The wáy was lóng, the wind was cold—
 Mérrily, mérrily, sháll I live nów—
 But váinly thou wárrést—
 At the clóse of the dáy when the hámlet is stíll—

are (*a*) trochaic; (*b*) iambic; (*c*) dactylic; (*d*) amphibrachych; and (*e*) anapæstic, respectively. And thus, with the exception of the word *amphibrachych* (which I do not remember to have seen), the terms have been used. And, on this principle, with the same exception, systems of versification have been classified.

§ 247. To show, however, that this view is exceptionable, let us compare a so-called English anapæst like—

As they splásh in the blóod of the slíppery streét—

with

Δεκάτον μιν ἐτός τοῦ ἐπί Πριάμου.

For the latter line to have the same movement as the former, it must be read thus—

Dekatón men etós to d' epéi Priamóu.

Now we well know that, whatever may be an English scholar's notions of the Greek accents, this is not the way in which he reads Greek anapæsts.

§ 248. Again. *certain classical feet have no English equivalents.*—Whoever has considered the principles of English prosody, must have realized the important fact that, *ex vi termini, no English measure can have either more or less than one accented syllable.* On the other hand, the classical métrists have several measures wherein there is both more and less than one long syllable. Thus, to go no farther than the trisyllabic feet, we have the pyrrhic (◡ ◡) and tribrach (◡ ◡ ◡) without one at all, and the spondee (— —), amphimacer (— ◡ —), and molossus (— — —) with more than one. It follows, then, that (even *mutatis mutandis, i. e.* with the accent considered as the equivalent to the long syllable) English pyrrhics, English tribrachs, English amphimacers, English spondees, and English molossi, are, each and all, prosodial impossibilities.

§ 249. Notwithstanding the difference of the principle upon which they are constructed, the classical metres, even as read by Englishmen, and read *accentually*, are metrical to English ears. This is because, notwithstanding the extent to which quantity differs from accent, there is no metre so exclusively founded upon the former as to be without a certain amount of the latter; and in the majority (at least) of the metres under notice *there is a sufficient amount of accentual elements to constitute metre; even independent of the quantitative ones.*

The following is the notation of the extract in the preceding chapter:—

```

x x a x a x a x a
a x a x a x a
a x x a x a x a
a x x x x a x x a
a x a x a x x
x a x x a x x a x x a
a x x a x x a x a
a x x a x x a x x a

```

x a x a x x a x a
 a x x a x x a x a
 x x a x a x x a x a
 x a x x a x x a x a
 x x a x x a x a x a
 a x a x a x a x
 a x a x a x a
 a x a x a x a
 a x a x a x a x

Now many Latin metres present a recurrence of accent little more irregular than this; *e. g.*

1.

Accentual Formula of the Latin Sapphic.

a x x a x		a x a x a x	
a x x a x		a x a x a x	
a x x a x		a x a x a x	
			a x x a x
a x x a x		a x a x a x	
a x x a x		a x a x a x	
a x x a x		a x a x a x	
			a x x a x

2.

Latin Asclepiad.

HORACE, *Od.* I. I. 1—6.

x a x a x x		a x x a x x
a x x a x x		a x a x a x
a x a x a x		a x x a x x
a x a x a x		x x x a x x
a x a x a x		a x x a x x
x a x a x x		a x x a x a x

3.

Latin Hexameter.

Æn. I. 1—5.

a x x a x a x a x x a x x a x
 x a x x a x a x x x a x x a x
 a x x x a x a x x x a x x a x
 x a x x a x a x x x a x x a x

A longer list of examples would show us that, throughout the whole of the classical metres, the same accents recur, sometimes with less, and sometimes with but very

little more irregularity than they recur in the *unsymmetrical* metres of our own language; and this in a prosody based upon *quantity*.

§ 250. *Conversion of English into classical metres.*—In the preface to his Translation of Aristophanes, Mr. Walsh has shown, that, by a different distribution of lines, very fair hexameters may be made out of the well-known lines on the Burial of Sir John Moore:—

Not a drum was
 Heard, not a funeral note, as his corse to the rampart we hurried,
 Not a soldier dis-
 Charged his farewell shot o'er the grave where our hero we buried.
 We buried him
 Darkly at dead of night, the sods with our bayonets turning;
 By the struggling
 Moonbeam's misty light and the lantern dimly burning.
 Lightly they'll
 Talk of the spirit that's gone, and o'er his cold ashes upbraid him,
 But little he'll
 Reck if they let him sleep on in the grave where a Briton has laid him.

Again, such lines as Coleridge's—

1. Make ready my grave clothes to-morrow;
 or Shelley's—

2. Liquid Peneus was flowing,
 are the exact analogues of lines like—

1. Jam lacte depulsus leonem,
 and—

2. Grato Pyrrha sub antro.

although not written with an eye to anything Latin.

PART IV.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY NOTICES.—NAMES.—PROPOSITIONS.

§ 251. *Names*.—Names are of two kinds, *invariable* and *variable*. Words like *man*, *father*, *sun*, *stone*, &c., are *invariable*. They always denote objects belonging to the same class. No man calls a *tree* a *stone*. On the other hand, the word *I*, taken by itself, is not the name of one object more than another. It varies in meaning with the person speaking. When *William* uses the term, it means *William*. When *Thomas* does so, it means *Thomas*. It denotes the speaker, whoever he may be; but it is not the fixed name of any speaker whatever. Again, when *thou* is said to *William*, it means *William*. When *thou* is said to *Thomas*, it means *Thomas*. It denotes the person spoken to, whoever he may be; but it is not the fixed name of any person spoken to in particular. Again—*We* denotes the parties who are speaking; and when different individuals speak, it denotes different persons. The same applies to the word *ye*. The word *he*, taken by itself, is not the name of one object more than another. It varies in meaning according to the person spoken of. When *he* is used in speaking of *William*, it means *William*. When *he* is used in speak-

ing of *Thomas*, it means *Thomas*. The same applies to *she*, *it*, and *they*. The word *this*, taken by itself, is not the name of one object more than another. It varies in meaning according to the object spoken of. When applied to an object near one person, it means one thing. When applied to an object near another person, it means something else. The same applies to *that*, *these*, and to several other words. They are all *variable* names.

§ 252. *Inherent qualities*.—If we ask *why* certain names can be *variable* whilst others cannot, we shall find our answer in the difference between inherent qualities and relations. The ordinary qualities of objects are, more or less, permanent. If an object be *white*, it cannot become *black* or *red* without an absolute change in its nature or characteristics. It may not, indeed, be converted into something else; inasmuch as the change may not go far enough to affect its essential qualities. Nevertheless, the change may be considerable, and it may be of a permanent kind. It is, certainly, *internal*; i. e. it applies to something contained within the range of attributes that belong to the substance in which they occur, and *inherent* to the substance itself.

§ 253. *Relation*.—But what are we to say to changes that, leaving all the ordinary qualities of an object exactly as they were, still are changes? What are we to say to changes that, in some sense, are no changes at all? Do we not, in the first place, ask whether they actually exist? Can one man be converted into another at all? Can he be so converted without any alteration whatever of any one of his qualities? He can. A man may, for the purposes of language, take a word which will describe another man, a horse, an inanimate object, or anything else *in rerum naturâ*; and that truly, and without losing any one of its original qualities, or gaining any fresh ones. The *father* of John may be the *son* of Thomas. Yet

father and *son* are, essentially, different (not to say opposite) names. A *stone* in a certain relation to the speaker (*i. e.* in his hand) is named *this*. The same stone, when thrown to a distance, is named *that*. Again—the word *this*, immediately after doing duty as the name of a *stone*, may stand for a *father*, a *son*, a *pen*, &c., &c. Nevertheless, the *stones*, *fathers*, *sons*, *pens*, &c., that are named *this* (or *these*) are, in all matters of ordinary quality, the same as the *fathers*, *sons*, *pens*, &c., named *that* (or *those*); the change of attribute that justifies the change of name being simply that of *relation* to either the speaker or some other object.

§ 254. It may be said that words like *this* and *that* are not *names*. That they are not permanent, unchangeable, and irremovable names is true. But why should permanence be considered essential to the idea of a name? The words in question denote *objects*; and it would be difficult to show that more than this is necessary to constitute a name. The fact is that words of the sort in question are not only names, but names of a very important kind.

§ 255. *Propositions—Terms*.—The simplest sentence that can be formed implies two things—(1) something that is spoken about; (2) something that is said concerning it, *e. g.*—*sun warm, winter cold, fire bright, &c.*

The word which conveys the idea of the thing spoken about, is called the Subject.

The word which conveys the idea of what is said concerning it, is called the Predicate. In the preceding examples, *sun, winter, and fire* are subjects, whilst *warm, cold, and bright* are predicates. Subjects and predicates, collectively, are called Terms.

The combination of a subject and a predicate is called a Proposition. In every proposition there are not only

two terms, but one of them is a predicate, the other a subject.

§ 256. *The Copula*.—It is only, however, in the ruder languages, and the language of children, that propositions consist of subjects and predicates only. In the more developed forms of human speech there is a third element; viz. the Copula: the copula showing whether the predicate agree, or disagree, with the subject. In English the copulas are *is* and *is not*,—as *winter is cold*, *winter is not cold*.

§ 257. Different words constitute different parts of the proposition, *e. g.* words like *sun*, *winter*, *bright*, *cold*, &c., can, *by themselves and without the addition of any other word*, constitute terms. On the contrary, words like *a*, *an*, *the*, *brightly*, *from*, *and*, &c., can only form *parts of terms*. We can say, *the fire is bright*. We cannot say—*the is bright*, *fire is the*, &c. Other words are capable of forming, *by themselves and without the addition of any other word*, terms, *and something more*, *e. g.* *water boils*. Here *boils* = *is boiling*, and serves for predicate and copula as well. Others, without entering into any *single term*, or proposition, may stand between *two*. This is the case with the words *or* and *because* in the following sentences:—

1. All men are black *or* white.

2. The water is boiling,

because

The fire is blazing.

Others, like *oh*, *pish*, *ah*, may exist without forming, or helping to form, or connecting propositions at all. The class, however, to which these and their like belong is not very important.

§ 258. *Parts of Speech*.—The place that a word takes in a proposition, *combined with the principle on which it takes it*, determines the class to which a word belongs

as a part of speech, i. e. as a Substantive, Adjective, Verb, Conjunction, and the like. The words in italics are important. Although position itself is *generally* sufficient to determine the character of a word, it is not so *always*. The words *I* and *father* can equally, by themselves and without the addition of any other word, constitute *either* subjects or predicates, as (1) *I am coming—it is I*. (2) *Father is coming—it is father*. Yet *I* is a pronoun, whereas *father* is a substantive.

CHAPTER II.

ETYMOLOGY.—COMPOSITION, AND DERIVATION IN GENERAL.

§ 259. *Etymology*.—The essential parts of Grammar are Etymology and Syntax. Etymology deals with the changes of *form* which *single* words undergo: Syntax with the *combination of more words than one*.

§ 260. *Two kinds of etymology*.—There is a difference of form between *pater* and *father*; but, as the words belong to different languages, the etymology which takes cognizance of them is of the kind called *historical* or *comparative*. There is, also, a difference in form between *father* and *fathers*; but here both words belong to the same language. The etymology which takes cognizance of this is the etymology of the special grammarian—the etymology of the following pages.

§ 261. *Composition and derivation*.—In *fathers* we have a formation deduced from the radical word *father*. In *fatherlike* we have a compound word capable of being analyzed into the two primitive words, 1. *father*; 2. *like*. This leads to the notice of (1) Composition, (2) Derivation.

1. When *two separate* words are joined together so as to form one, the result is a *Compound*, as *day-light*, *day-star*, *nut-brown*, *heart-whole*, *foot-sore*.

2. When a word is changed by the *addition of some new sound* or by the *change of one previously existing*, a *Derivative* is the result, and an instance of *derivation* is supplied. Thus—

hunt- <i>er</i>	from	hunt	gos- <i>ling</i>	from	goose
gird- <i>le</i>	—	gird	drunk- <i>ard</i>	—	drunk
wood- <i>en</i>	—	wood	east- <i>ern</i>	—	east
shad- <i>ow</i>	—	shade	good- <i>ness</i>	—	good
thrif- <i>t</i>	—	thrive	spin- <i>ster</i>	—	spin, &c.

Certain Derivations are called *Inflections*; of which more will be said in the sequel.

CHAPTER III.

COMPOSITION DEFINED.—ACCENT.—ORDER OF ELEMENTS.
—APPARENT EXCEPTIONS.—DETAILS.

§ 262. *Composition*.—*Composition is the joining together, in language, of two different words, treated as a single term.* Observe the following elements in this definition—

1. *In language*.—Words like *merry-making* are divided by the hyphen. Now, it is very plain that if all words *spelt* with a hyphen were to be considered as compounds, the formation of them would be not a matter of speech or *language*, but one of writing or spelling. This distinguishes compounds in *language* from mere printers' compounds.

2. *Different*.—In Old High-German we find the form *selp-sēlpo*. Here there is the junction of two words, but

not the junction of two *different* ones. This distinguishes composition proper from *gemination*.

3. *Words*.—In *father-s*, *clear-er*, *four-th*, &c., there is the addition of a letter or a syllable, and it may be even of the part of a word. There is no addition, however, of a whole one. This distinguishes composition from *derivation*.

4. *Treating the combination as a single term*.—In the eyes of one grammarian the term *mountain height* may be as truly a compound word as *sunbeam*. In the eyes of another it may be no *compound* but *two* words like *Alpine height*; *mountain* being dealt with as an adjective.

§ 263. *Accent of compound words*.—It is in the determination of this that the accent plays an important part.

The attention of the reader is drawn to* the following line, slightly altered from Churchill:

Then rést, my friénd, and spáre thy précíous bréath.

Compared with *and*, the verb *spare* is not only accented, but the accent is conspicuous and prominent. There is so little on the one word and so much on the other, that the disparity is very manifest. But this disparity may be diminished. The true reading is—

Then rést, my friénd, spáre, spáre thy précíous breath.

Where we actually find what had previously only been supposed. In the words *spare*, *spare*, the accents are nearly at *par*. To proceed. Good illustrations of the parity and disparity of accent may be drawn from certain names of places. Let there be such a sentence as *the lime house near the new port*. Compare the parity of accent here, with the disparity of accent in the compound words *Límehouse* and *Néwport*. Compare, too, *bláck bírd*, meaning *a bird that is black*, with *bláckbird* the Latin *merula*; or *blúe bél*, meaning *a bell that is blue*, with *blúebell*; the flower. Expressions like *a shárp édged*

instrument, meaning *an instrument that is sharp and has edges*, as opposed to a *sharp-edged instrument*, meaning *an instrument with sharp edges*, further exemplify this difference. Subject to a few exceptions, it may be laid down, that, in the English language, *there is no composition unless there be either a change of form or a change of accent.*

§ 264. *Differences of meaning.*—In a *red house*, each word preserves its natural and original meaning, and the statement suggested by the term is *that a house is red*. By a parity of reasoning, a *mad house* should mean *a house that is mad*; and, provided that each word retain its natural meaning and its natural accent, such is the fact. Let a *house* mean, as it often does, a *family*. Then the phrase, a *mad house*, means that the *house*, or *family* is *mad*, just as a *red house* means that the *house* is *red*. Such, however, is not the current meaning of the word. Every one knows that a *mad house* means *a house for mad men*; in which case it is treated as a compound word, and has a marked accent on the first syllable, just as *Limehouse* has. Compared with the words *red house*, meaning a house of a *red colour*, and compared with the words *mad house* meaning a *deranged family*, the word *madhouse*, in its common sense, expresses a compound idea, as opposed to two ideas, or a double idea. Such the commentary upon *treating the combination as a single term*; in other words, such the difference between a *compound word* and *two words*.

§ 265. *Order of elements.*—In compound words it is the *first* term that defines or particularizes the *second*. That the idea given by the word *apple-tree* is not referable to the words *apple* and *tree*, irrespective of the order in which they occur, may be seen by reversing the position of them. *Tree-apple*, although not existing in the language, is as correct a term as *thorn-apple*. In

tree-apple, the particular sort of *apple* meant is denoted by the word *tree*, and if there were in our gardens various sorts of plants called *apples*, of which some grew along the ground and others upon trees, such a word would be required in order to be opposed to *earth-apple*, or *ground-apple*, or some word of the kind. However, as the word is *not* current in the language, the class of compounds indicated by it may seem to be merely imaginary. Nothing, however, is further from being the case. A *tree-rose* is a *rose*, a *rose-tree* a *tree* of a particular sort. A *ground-nut* is a *nut* particularized by growing in the ground. A *nut-ground* is a *ground* particularized by producing nuts. A *finger-ring*, as distinguished from *ear-rings* and from *rings* in general, is a *ring* for the *finger*. A *ring-finger*, as distinguished from *fore-fingers* and from *fingers* in general, is a *finger* whereon *rings* are worn. At times this rule seems to be violated. The words *spitfire* and *daredevil* seem exceptions to it. At the first glance it seems, in the case of a *spitfire*, that what he (or she) *spits* is *fire*; and that in the case of a *daredevil* what (he or she) *dares* is the *devil*. If so, the initial words *spit* and *dare* are particularized by the final ones *fire* and *devil*. The true idea, however, confirms the original rule. A *spitfire* voids his fire by spitting. A *daredevil*, in meeting the fiend, would not only not shrink from him, but would defy him. A *spitfire* is not one who spits *fire*, but one whose *fire* is *spit*. A *daredevil* is not one who dares even the devil, but one by whom the *devil* is even *dared*. Again, in words like *pea-cock* and *pea-hen*, &c., we have apparent exceptions. They are, however, only *apparent*. The word *pea* (though now found in composition only) was, originally, an independent word, and the name of a species of fowl, like *pheasant*, *partridge*, or any other appellation. It was the Latin *pavo*, German *pfau*. Hence, if the word *peacock* mean a *pea* (*pfau* or

pavo) that is male, then do *wood-cock*, *black-cock*, and *gor-cock*, mean *woods*, *blacks*, and *gors* that are male. Or if the word *peahen* mean a *pea* (*pfau* or *pavo*) that is female, then do *moorhen* and *guineahen* mean *moors* and *guineas* that are female. Again, if a *peahen* mean a *pea* (*pfau* or *pavo*) that is female, then does the compound *pheasant-hen* mean the same as *henpheasant*; which is not the case. The fact is, that *peacock* means a *cock that is a pea* (*pfau* or *pavo*); *peahen* means a *hen that is a pea* (*pfau* or *pavo*); and, finally, *peafowl* means a *fowl that is a pea* (*pfau* or *pavo*). In the same way *moorfowl* means, not a *moor that is connected with a fowl*, but a *fowl that is connected with a moor*.

§ 266. Of the two elements of a compound word, which is the most important? In one sense the latter, in another sense the former. The latter word is the most *essential*; since the general idea of *trees* must exist before it can be defined or particularized, so becoming the idea which we have in *apple-tree*, *rose-tree*, &c. The former word, however, is the most *influential*. It is by this that the original idea is qualified.

§ 267. *On certain words wherein the fact of their being compound is obscured.*—Composition is the addition of a *word* to a word, Derivation the addition of certain *sounds* or *syllables* to a word. In a Compound, *each* element has a separate and independent existence; in a Derivative, only *one* of the elements has such. Now it is very possible that in an older stage of a language two words may exist, may be put together, and may form a compound, each word having a separate and independent existence; whilst, in a later stage of language, only one of these words may have a separate and independent existence, the other having become obsolete. In this case a compound word would take the appearance of a derived one; inasmuch as only one of its elements could be

exhibited. Such is the case with (amongst others) the word *bishopric*. In the present language the word *ric*, with the sense here required, has no separate and independent existence. For all this, the compound is a true one; since, in Anglo-Saxon, we have the noun *rice* as a separate, independent word, signifying *kingdom* or *domain*. Again, without becoming obsolete, a word may alter its form. This is the case with most of our adjectives in *-ly*. At present they appear to be derivative; the termination *-ly* having no separate and independent existence. The older language, however, shows that they are compounds; since *-ly* is nothing else than *-lic*, Anglo-Saxon; *-lih*, Old High-German; *-leiks*, Mæso-Gothic = *like*, or *similis* = *otherwise*, *in vain*.

The following words are in the same predicament.

Mis-, as in *misdeed*, &c.—Mæso-Gothic, *missó* = *in turns*; Old Norse, *á mis* = *alternately*; Middle High-German, *misse* = *mistake*. The original notion was that of *alternation*, thence *change*, thence *defect*. Compare the Greek ἄλλως.

Dom, as in *wisdom*, &c.—the substantive being *dón*.

Hood, and *head*, as in *Godhead*, *manhood*, &c. The substantive being *háids* = *person*, *order*, *kind*. Nothing to do with the word *head*.

Ship, as in *friendship*.—Anglo-Saxon, *-sripe*, and *-sceaft*; German, *-schaft*; Mæso-Gothic, *gaskafts* = *a creature*, or *creation*. The *-skip* or *-scape* in *landskip* is only an older form. Nothing to do with the *ship* that sails.

Less, as in *sleepless*, &c., has nothing to do with *less*. Derived from *láus*, *lós*, *destitute of* = Latin *expers*.

§ 268. *Third element in compounds*.—It must be clear, *ex vi termini*, that in every compound there are *two* parts; i. e. the whole or part of the original, and the whole or part of the superadded, word. Are

there ever *more* than two? Yes. There is, sometimes, a third element, viz. a vowel, consonant, or syllable, that joins the first word with the second. In the older forms of all the German languages the presence of this third element was the rule rather than the exception. In the present English it exists in but few words; and that doubtfully.

(a) The *-a-* in *black-a-moor* is possibly such a connecting element.

(b) The *-in-* in *night-in-gale* is, perhaps, one also. Compare the German form *nacht-i-gall*, and remember the tendency of vowels to take the sound of *-ng* before *g*.

§ 269. The *-s-* in words like *Thur-s-day*, *hunt-s-man*, may be one of two things—

(a) It may be the sign of the genitive case, so that *Thursday* = *Thoris dies*. In this case the word, like *pater-familias* in Latin, is in a common state of syntactic construction.

(b) It may be a connecting sound, like the *-i-* in *nacht-i-gall*. Reasons for this view occur in the fact that in the modern German the genitive case of *feminine* nouns ends otherwise than in *-s*; whilst, nevertheless, the sound of *-s-* occurs in composition whether the noun it follows be masculine or feminine. This fact, as far as it goes, makes it convenient to consider the sound in question as a connective rather than a case. Probably, it is neither one nor the other exactly, but the effect of a false analogy.

§ 270. *Compound radicals*.—Words like *midshipman*, *gentlemanlike*, &c., must be treated as formations from a compound radical: and analyzed thus—*midship-man*, *gentleman-like*.

§ 271. There is a number of words which are rarely found by themselves; or, if so found, have rarely the

same sense that they have in *combination*. Such are the expressions *time and tide—might and main—rede me my riddle—pay your shot—rhyme and reason*, &c.

§ 272. *Details*.—By attending to the following sections we shall see in what way the different parts of speech are capable of being put together by composition.

Substantives preceded by Substantives.—*Day-star, morning-star, evening-star, land-slip, watch-house, light-house, rose-tree, oak-tree, fir-tree, harvest-time, goose-grass, sea-man, collar-bone, shoulder-blade, ground-nut, earth-nut, hazel-nut, fire-wood, sun-light, moon-light, star-light, torch-light*, &c.

Substantives preceded by Adjectives.—*Blind-worm, free-man, half-penny, grey-beard, green-sward, white-thorn, black-thorn, mid-day, mid-summer, quick-silver, holy-day*, &c.

Substantives preceded by Verbs.—*Turn-spit, spit-fire, dare-devil, sing-song, turn-coat*, &c.

Substantives preceded by the form in *-ing*.—*Turning-lathe, sawing-mill*.

Adjectives preceded by Substantives.—*Sinful, thankful, blood-red, eye-bright, coal-black, snow-white, nut-brown, heart-whole, ice-cold, foot-sore*, &c.

Adjectives preceded by Adjectives.—*All-mighty, two-fold, many-fold*, &c.

Adjectives preceded by Verbs.—*Stand-still, live-long*.

Verbs preceded by Substantives.—*God-send*. Rare.

Verbs preceded by Adjectives.—*Little-heed, rough-hew* (?). Rare.

Verbs preceded by Verbs.—*Hear-say*. Rare.

Present Participles preceded by Adjectives.—*All-seeing, all-ruling, soft-flowing, fast-sailing, merry-making*.

Past Participles preceded by Adjectives.—*New-born, free-spoken, fresh-made, new-made, new-laid*.

* Reasons for using this term are to be found in p. 242.

Present Participles preceded by Substantives.—*Fruit-bearing, music-making.*

Past Participles preceded by Substantives.—*Heaven-born, bed-ridden, blood-stained.*

Verbal Substantives preceded by Substantives.—*Man-eater, woman-eater, kid-napper, horn-blower.*

Verbal Adjectives preceded by Substantives.—*Mop-headed, chicken-hearted.*

Verbal Adjectives preceded by Adjectives.—*Cold-hearted, flaxen-haired, hot-headed, curly-pated.*

§ 273. *Adverbs* entering into composition are of two sorts:—(1.) Those that can be separated from the word with which they combine, and, nevertheless, appear as independent words; as *over, under, well, &c.* (2.) Those that, when they are separated from the verb with which they combine, have no independent existence as separate words.—(a) *Be-hove, be-fit, be-seem, be-lieve, be-lie, be-spatter, be-smear, be-get, be-labour, be-do, be-gin, be-gird, be-hold, be-mourn, be-reave, be-deck, be-think, be-mire, be-rhyme.* The forms throughout the allied languages are generally *bi-* or *be-*. (b) *Un-bind, un-do, un-loose, un-lock, un-wind.* The forms of this Inseparable in the different allied languages are—in Mæso-Gothic, *and-*; in Old High-German, *ind-, int-, in-*; in Old Saxon, *ant-*; in Middle and New High-German, *ent-*; in Anglo-Saxon, *on-*; as *on-bindan* (*un-bind*), *on-don* (*un-do*), *on-lȳsan* (*un-loose*), *on-lūcan* (*un-lock*), *on-windan* (*un-wind*). (c) *A-light, a-rouse, a-rise, a-wake, a-waken, a-bet, a-bide, a-llay.* The forms of this Inseparable are different in the different allied languages. In Mæso-Gothic, *us-*; in Old High-German, *ur-, ar-, ir-, er-, ěr-*; in Old Saxon, and in Anglo-Saxon, *ā-*; as *ā-rīsan* (*arise*), *ā-weccan* (*a-wake*). (d) *For-get, for-do, fore-go, for-give, for-bid, for-bear, for-swear.* The *for-* here is of a different origin, and different in meaning and power, from the *fore-* in words like

fore-tell. In the different allied languages it takes different forms. In Mæso-Gothic, *fúir*, *faúr*, *fra*. In Old High-German *far*, *fer*, *fir*, *for*. In Middle and New High-German, *ver*. In Anglo-Saxon, *for*.

§ 274. *Compound Pronouns*.—Of those words which, though really compound, look most especially like simple ones, certain pronouns are the most important; and of these the foremost is

1. *Which*.—To follow the ordinary grammarians, and to call it the neuter of *who*, is a blunder. It is no neuter at all, but a compound word. The adjective *leiks*, *like*, is preserved in the Mæso-Gothic words *galciks* and *missaleiks*. In Old High-German the form is *lih*, in Anglo-Saxon *lic*. Hence we have Mæso-Gothic, *hwêleiks*; Old High-German, *hwêlih*; Anglo-Saxon, *hwilic* and *hwilc*; Old Frisian, *hwelik*; Danish, *hwilk-en*; German, *welch*; Scotch, *whilk*; English, *which*. The same is the case with—

2. *Such*.—Mæso-Gothic, *svaleiks*; Old High-German, *sôlth*; Old Saxon, *sulic*; Anglo-Saxon, *swilc*; German, *solch*; English, *such*. Rask's derivation of the Anglo-Saxon *swilc* from *swa-ylc*, is exceptionable.

3. *Thick*.—An old English word, found in the provincial dialects, as *thick*, *thuck*, *theck*, and hastily derived by many good authorities from *se ylca*, is found in the following forms: Mæso-Gothic, *þêleiks*; Norse, *hwilikr*.

4. *Ilk*.—Found in the Scotch, and generally preceded by *that*, as *that ilk*, meaning *the same*. In Anglo-Saxon this word is *ylca*, preceded also by the article; *se ylca*, *seó ylce*, *þæt ylce*. In English, as seen above, the word is replaced by *same*.

5. *Each*.—The particle *i* or *e* from *gi* enters in the composition of pronouns. Old High-German, *éogaliher*, every one; *éocalih*, all; Middle High-German, *iegelich*: New

High-German, *jeglich*; Anglo-Saxon, *ælc*; English, *each*; the *l* being dropped as in *which* and *such*. *Ælc*, as the original of the English *each* and the Scotch *ilka*,* must by no means be confounded with the word *ylce*, *the same*.

6. *Every*, in Old English, *everich*, *everech*, *everilk one*, is *ælc*, preceded by the particle *ever*.

7. *Either*.—Old High-German, *éogahuëdar*; Middle High-German, *iegewëder*; Anglo-Saxon, *æghwüðer*, *æyðer*; Old Frisian, *eider*.

8. *Neither*.—The same with *n-* prefixed.

9. *Aught*.—In Mæso-Gothic is found the particle *aiv*, *ever*, but only in negative propositions; *ni* (*not*) preceding it. Its Old High-German form is *éo*, *io*; in Middle High-German, *ie*; in New High-German, *je*; in Old Saxon, *io*; in Anglo-Saxon, *d*; in Norse, *æ*. Combined with this particle, the word *whit* (*thing*) gives the following forms: Old High-German, *éowiht*; Anglo-Saxon, *áwiht*; Old Frisian, *dwet*; English, *ought*. The word *naught* is *ought* preceded by the negative particle.

§ 275. *Further remarks on the compounds of like*.—The statements of § 267 have shown that the adjective *like*, when it enters into composition, is a peculiar word. It has a great tendency to change its form. The pronouns, *which* and *such*, more especially show this; inasmuch as, in them, even the characteristic *l* is lost. So it is in Frisian, where *hok* = *which*, and *sok* = *such*.

The change into *-ly* now commands a notice. Add it to a Substantive, and the result is an Adjective; as *man*, *manly*. Add it to an Adjective, and the result is an Adverb; as *brave*, *brave-ly*. But what if the Adjective already end in *-ly*, as *daily*? Can we say *dail-i-ly*? For further notice upon this point see the Syntax of Adjectives.

* Different from *ilka*.

§ 276. *Ten and ty.*—The words *thir-teen, four-teen, &c.*, are compounds. This is clear. It is equally clear that they are compounds of *three* (or *four*) and *ten*: their arithmetical value being $3 + 10 = 13$. That words like *thir-ty, for-ty, &c.*, are also compound is not quite so evident, inasmuch as the element *-ty* has no separate and independent existence. Nevertheless, the words in question are not only compounds, but their elements are *three* (or *four, &c.*) and *ten*—or if not the actual word *ten*, one of its derivatives. In Mæso-Gothic we find the root *-tig* used as a true substantive, equivalent in form as well as power to the Greek *δέκα*—*tváim tigum þusandjom* = *duobus decadibus myriadum*; (Luke xiv. 31.) *jéré þrijé tigivé* = *annorum duarum decadum*. (Luke iii. 23.) *þrins tiguns silubrinaize* = *tres decadas argenteorum*. (Matthew xxvii. 3, 9.)

In Icelandic, the numbers from 20 to 100 are formed by means of *tigr*, declined like *viðr*, and naturally taking the word which it numerically determines in the genitive case.

<i>Nom.</i> Fjórir tigr manna	=	<i>four tens of men.</i>
<i>Gen.</i> Fjögurra tiga manna	=	<i>of four tens of men.</i>
<i>Dat.</i> Fjórum tigum manna	=	<i>to four tens of men.</i>
<i>Acc.</i> Fjóra tiga manna	=	<i>four tens of men.</i>

This is the form of the inflection in the best and oldest MSS. A little later was adopted the *indeclinable* form *tigi*, which was used adjectivally.*

§ 277. *Eleven.*—The *e* in *e-leven* is *ein* = *one*. *Ein-lif, ein-lef, eilef, eilf, elf*, Old High-German; *andlova*, Old Frisian; *end-leofan, end-lufan*, Anglo-Saxon. This is universally admitted.

The *-lev-* is a modification of the root *laib-an* =

* *Det Oldnorske Sprogs Grammatik*, af P. A. Munch, og C. B. Unger, Christiania, 1847.

manere = *to stay* = *to be over*. Hence *eleven* = *one over (ten)*. This is *not* universally admitted.

§ 278. *Twelve* = the root *two* + the root *laib* = *two over (ten)*. *Tvalif*, Mæso-Gothic; *züelif*, Old High-German; *toll*, Swedish.—The same doubts that apply to the doctrine that the *-lv-* in *eleven* represents the root *-laib*, apply to the *-lv-* in *twelve*. They arise out of the belief, held by many competent judges, in a series of letter-changes which would bring *l-f* (or *l-v*) out of *d-k* = *ten*; in which case the numerals in question, instead of being peculiar in their composition, would follow the principle which gives us *thirteen*, *fourteen*, and the rest; and simply stand for $10 + 1$, and $10 + 2$. The chief fact in favour of this is the Lithuanic form *lik*, wherein *l* is reasonably believed to represent *d*.

§ 279. *Father + his*.—The doctrine now (as it is to be hoped) no longer common that the forms like *father's*, are a corruption of *father his*, is only noticed to be condemned. Expressions like *Jesus Christ his sake* are the chief foundation for it. But—

1. Expressions like *the Queen's Majesty* cannot be so explained.

2. Nor yet expressions like *the children's bread*.

3. *His*, cannot be *he + his*.

4. The *s* is really the *s* in *patris* from *pater*, and other genitive cases, both in Latin and the allied languages.

CHAPTER IV.

DERIVATION.—CLASSIFICATION OF DERIVATIVES.—

DETAILS.

§ 280. DERIVATION proper may be divided according to a variety of principles. Amongst others—

1. *According to the evidence.*—In the evidence that a word is not simple, but derived, there are at least two degrees. Thus—

(a) That the word *strength* is a derivative, I infer from the word *strong*, an independent form, which I can separate from it. Of the nature of the word *strength* there is the clearest evidence, or evidence of the first degree.

(b) *Fowl, hail, nail, sail, tail, soul, &c.*, are in Anglo-Saxon, *fugel, hægel, nægel, segel, tægel, sawel*, and, by the best grammarians, are considered as derivatives. Yet, with these words I cannot do what was done with the word *strength*. I cannot take from them the part which I look upon as the derivational addition, and after that leave an independent word. *Strength—th* is a true word; *fowl* or *fugel—l* is no true word. If I believe these latter words to be derivations at all, I do it because I find in words like *handle, &c.*, the *-l* as a derivational addition. Yet, as the fact of a sound being, sometimes, used as a derivational addition does not preclude it from being, at other times, a part of the root, the evidence that the words in question are not simple, but derived, is not absolutely conclusive. In other words, it is evidence of the second degree.

2. *According to the effect.*—The syllable *-en* in the word *whiten* changes the noun *white* into a verb. This is its effect. We may so classify our derivatives as to arrange combinations like *-en* (whose effect is to give the idea of the verb) in one group; whilst combinations like *th* (whose effect is to give the idea of abstraction) form another order.

3. *According to the form.*—Sometimes the derivational element is a vowel (as in the *-ie* in *doggie*); sometimes a consonant (as the *-th* in *strength*); sometimes a syllable (as the *-en* in *whiten*); sometimes a change of vowel without any addition (as the *i* in *tip*, compared with *top*);

sometimes a change of consonant without any addition (as the *z* in *prize*, compared with *price*). To classify derivations in this manner is to classify them according to their form.

4. *According to the number of the derivational elements.*—In *fisher*, as compared with *fish*, there is but one derivational affix. In *fishery*, as compared with *fish*, the number of derivational elements is two.

§ 281. In the present work none of these principles will be exclusively adhered to. On the contrary, at the expense of a little repetition, a *general* view of our several derivational *forms* will be followed by a series of remarks upon our Diminutive, our Patronymic, our Gentile, Abstract, and other, nouns,—some of these groups (groups formed by the *effect* of the derivational element in making the word to which it belongs what it is) being of particular etymological importance.

§ 282. *Details in the way of form.*—Addition of a Vowel.—*Bab-y* from *babe*. In Lowland Scotch this is far more common, and is spelt *-ie*, as *dogg-ie*, *lass-ie*, *ladd-ie*, *mous-ie*, *wif-ie*.

Addition of L.—1. Substantives.—*gird-le*, *kern-el*.

2. Adjectives.—*litt-le*, *mick-le*.

3. Verbs.—*spark-le*.

Addition of R.—Substantives.—(a) Words that in A. S. ended in *-er*, and were of the *masculine* gender—*laugh-t-er*, *slaugh-t-er*.

(b) Words that in A. S. ended in *-er*, and were of the *neuter* gender—*lay-er*, *fodd-er*.

(c) Words that in A. S. ended in *-ere*, and were of the *masculine* gender. These are the names of agents, *e. g.* *read-er*, *siun-er*, *harp-er*, *hunt-er*, *lend-er*, &c.

(d) Words that in A. S. ended in *-ra*, and were of the *masculine*—*gander* (A. S. *gand-ra*).

Verbs — *hind-er*, *low-er*.

Addition of N.—Substantives.—*maid-en*, *mai-n* (as in *might* and *main*). That the *-n* is no part of the original word in *mai-n*, we see from the word *may*. The idea in both *may* and *mai-n* is that of *power*.

Adjectives.—Words of this sort express the circumstance of the object to which they are applied, being *made of the material of which* the radical part of the derivative is the name. Thus, *gold-en* is a derivative from *gold*, the material of which *golden guineas* are made. So, also, *oak-en*, *ash-en*, *beeck-en*, *braz-en*, *flax-en*, *gold-en*, *lead-en*, *silk-en*, *wood-en*, *wooll-en*, *hemp-en*, *wheat-en*, *oat-en*, *wax-en*. These, and their like, though not uncommon in the present English, were much commoner in A. S.; where, in addition to the foregoing, we find—

Treow-en	=	made of wood (tree)
Stán-en	=	— stone
Silfr-en	=	— silver
Cyper-en	=	— copper
Tigel-en	=	— pottery (tile)
Glas-en	=	— glass
Hyrn-en	=	— horn
Fell-en	=	— skin (fell),

and others. In—

Ber-en	=	appertaining to bears
Gæt-en	=	— goats
Swin-en	=	— swine
Yter-en	=	— otters,

the idea of *material* is departed from.

The *form* of this affix was, originally, *-ein*.

Mæso-Gothic.

Bariz-ein-s	=	made of barley (bere)
Silubr-ein-s	=	— silver
Eisarn-ein-s	=	— iron
Fill-ein-s	=	— skin (fell)
Thaúrn-ein-s	=	— thorn.

In *Old High* and *Middle High-German*, the long form continues; e. g. *stein-în*, *dûrn-în* = *made of stone*, *made*

of *thorn*. In the *New High-German*, the form is simply *-en*, or *-n*.

Addition of the sound of O, originating in *-ow* or *-ov*, and spelt in the present English *-ow*.—By comparison with *shade* and *mead*, the forms *shad-ow* and *mead-ow* are shown to be derivative; the evidence being conclusive. We can isolate the simpler form, and, still, find a word actually existent in the present language.

The evidence that the *-ow* in the *following* words is derivational is less decided; or (changing the expression) words like *gallows*, &c. are in the same category with *hail*, *tail*, &c. The *w* has grown out of a *-g-*.

<i>English.</i>	<i>Frisian.</i>		<i>English.</i>	<i>Frisian.</i>
Barr-ow	bair-ig		Swall-ow	swäll-ig
Gall-ow-s	gul-ig		Fall-ow	fall-ig
Furr-ow	furr-ig		Marr-ow	mar-ig
Sparr-ow	spärr-ig		Tall-ow	tul-ig

To a great extent this form in *w* ($=v$) is Danish; *e.g.* in Danish *marv* = *marrow*, though, in Swedish, the word is *merg*. In the Danish *furre* and *spurre* = *furrow* and *sparrow* the change is carried further. *Swallow* = the Frisian *swallig* means *throat*; being, in the present English, more or less of a vulgarism, *i.e.* when used as a substantive. *Swallow*, the name of the bird, has a different origin, and its *w* represents *b*, as in the German *schwalbe*.

Addition of T.—1. Substantives.—(a) Words which in A. S. ended in *-t*, *gif-t*, *shrif-t*, *thef-t*, *wef-t* (*weave*), *rif-t*, *drif-t*, *thrif-t*, *fros-t* (*freeze*), *gris-t* (*grind*), *fligh-t*, *sigh-t*, *draugh-t* (*draw*), *weigh-t*.

(b) Words which in A. S. ended in *-ta*. The compounds of the word *wright* (from the root *work*, in the old past tense *wrought*); such as *cart-wright-t*, *wheel-wright-t*, *mill-wright-t*, &c.

2. Adjectives.—*tigh-t* (*tie*).

Addition of D.—Substantives.—*bran-d* (*burn*, *brenn*, obsolete), *floo-d* (*flow*), *mai-d* (*may* in Lowland Scotch), *see-d* (*sow*), *bur-d-en* (*bear*).

Addition of TH (A. S. þ as sounded in *thin*).—1. Substantives.—*dea-th*, *tru-th*, *weal-th*, *fil-th*, *til-th* (*tillage* or *tilled ground*), *ki-th* (as in the phrase *kith and kin*).

2. Adjectives.—The syllables *-cou-th* in the compound word *uncou-th*. This word originally means *unknown*, originating in the word *ken* = *to know*.

Addition of TH (A. S. ð) as sounded in *thine*.—*bur-th-en*, derived from *bear*.

Addition of the sound of the Z in *zeal*.—Verbs.—*cleanse* (*clenz*), from *clean*. In A. S. *clæn-s-ian*.

Addition of the sound of K.—*hill-ock*.

Addition of the sound of the vowel E (as in *feet*), originating in *-ig*, and spelt, in the present English, *-y*.—Of words like *blood-y*, *craft-y*, *drear-y*, *might-y*, *mist-y*, *mood-y*, *merr-y*, *worth-y*, &c., the A. S. forms were *blód-ig*, *cræft-ig*, *dreór-ig*, *miht-ig*, *mist-ig*, *mód-ig*, *myr-ig*, *worth-ig*, &c.

Addition of *-ing*, originally *-ung*—*farth-ing* ($\frac{1}{2}$), *rid-ing*, as in the three Ridings of Yorkshire, = ; a corruption from *thrith-ing*, *clean-s-ing*, *dawn-ing*, *morn-ing*. The fact that the *i*, in these words, was originally *u* is of great importance; as will be seen when we come to the consideration of the verbal abstracts. This is because, at the present moment, the syllable *-ing* is the termination of the present participle; so that (as far as the *form* goes) *dawn-ing* may be one of two things. It may be either the substantive *dawn* + the termination *-ing*, or the participle of the verb *dawn*. *Morn-ing*, however, can scarcely come from such a verb as *morn*. Meanwhile, *cleansing* is, to all appearances, more readily derived from the verb *cleanse* than from aught else. *Cleaning*, however, might be from either *clean* the adjective, or from

clean the verb. More will be said upon these points in the sequel.

Addition of *-kin*.—*lamb-kin* (*little lamb*), *mann-i-kin* (*little man*).

Addition of the syllable *-ard*.—*drunk-ard*, *stink-ard*.

Addition of the syllable *-old*.—*thresh-old*.

Addition of the syllable *-ern*.—*east-ern*, *west-ern*, *north-ern*, *south-ern*.

Addition of the syllable *-ish*.—*child ish*, *Engl-ish*, *self-ish*, *whit-ish*. The original form was *-isk*; *cild-isc* (*child-ish*), *Engl-isc* (*Engl-ish*), A. S.

Addition of the syllable *-ness*—*good-ness*, *bad-ness*, *wicked-ness*, *bright-ness*, *dark-ness*, *weari-ness*, *dreari-ness*, &c.

Change of the sound of a *consonant*—*cloth*, *clothe*; *grass*, *graze*. In each of these pairs of words the former is a substantive and the latter a verb.

Change of the sound of a *vowel*. (a) Verbs—*rise*, *raise*: *lie*, *lay*: *fall*, *fell*: *sit*, *set*. (b) Substantives—*top*, *tip*; *cat*, *kit*.

§ 283. *Double Derivatives*.—In words like *fishery* and others, the analysis is *fish-er-y*. In all such there are two derivational elements and the result is a double derivative. Of the details more will appear in the sequel.

§ 284. It was stated that certain compounds take the form of derivatives. It is now stated that certain derivatives may take the form of compounds. Let a word contain two derivational elements and let the combination coincide with some word actually in existence. That this is, by no means, impossible, is shown by forms in *-ling*: where *l + i + ng* gives us the name of a fish (*ling*). In this case, however, there is no fear of error. Every one knows that *duck-ling* is anything but the name of a *bird-fish*; anything but a *ling* of the *duck* kind. As far, how-

ever, as its mere *form* is concerned it might have been one. What, however, if in words like *upmost* the *m-* be one derivational element, and the *-ost* another? In such a case a derivative would simulate a compound, to an extent that might mislead. Whether such be really the case may be seen below.*

§ 285. For remarks upon Hybridism, see above. Of the exceptionable forms that have a fair claim to be considered as naturalized the most important are the following.

1. *The French feminine termination -ess attached to English roots.*—To say *duch-ess*, or *count-ess*, is correct. To say *shepherd-ess* is common, though exceptionable. No one, however, calls a female *fox* a *fox-ess*.

2. When the *-ess* is preceded by *-r-*, the result is *-ress*. The *-r-*, however, is no sign of gender. It is, itself, often preceded by *-t-*, which is no sign of gender either. In the Latin word *genitor* it is so preceded. The *-t-*, however, is non-radical; so that the analysis is *geni-t-or* = *producer* = *futher*; wherein the *-r-* denotes agency, and the *-t-* is the *-t-* in *geni-t-us* — wanting in *gen-ui*, *gen-us*, &c. These words in *-t-or* (observe the vowel *o*) form a natural class. They belong to the same declension, and they have a corresponding feminine in *-ix*; e. g. *geni-t-or*, *father*; *geni-t-rix*, *mother*. The oblique cases of *genitrix* are *geni-tricis*, *geni-trici*, *geni-tricem*, *genitricē*. They give, in the French, *-trice*; corresponding with the masculine form in *-eur* (= *or*). Hence—Latin, *actor*, *actrix*; French, *acteur*, *actrice*; English, *actor*, *actress*. In all these cases the vowel is *o*. Hence, the *-r-* in *master*, though preceded by *-t-*, is not in the same category with the *-r* in *actor*. The Latin is *magister*; Genitive, *magistri*; in French, it is *maître*; in the Feminine,

* Chapter on the Superlative Degree.

maitresse. The word, however, is an exceptional one; and, for practical purposes, the combination *-tr-* may be treated as accidental. The main fact connected with the words in *-tress*, is that their analysis is *-t-r-ess*, their origin the *-tricis*, *-tricem*, &c. in words like *genitricis*, &c., and their masculine *-tor*—*tor-* with an *o*, as *auctor*, *actor*; which in French becomes *eu*—*auteur*, *acteur*.

But the *-r-*, as a sign of agency, is English as well as Latin. However, the English termination is *-er*—never *-or*. We say *fact-or* rather than *fact-er*; but *bak-er* rather than *bak-or*.

<i>read-er</i>	<i>brew-er</i>	<i>kill-er</i>	<i>keep-er</i>
<i>lend-er</i>	<i>sinn-er</i>	<i>sleep-er</i>	<i>weav-er</i>
<i>mow-er</i>	<i>full-er</i>	<i>tell-er</i>	<i>spinn-er</i>
<i>fish-er</i>	<i>borrow-er</i>	<i>thatch-er</i>	<i>drink-er</i>
<i>writ-er</i>	<i>sow-er</i>	<i>reap-er</i>	<i>lov-er</i>
<i>look-er</i>	<i>deal-er</i>	<i>wander-er</i>	<i>mill-er</i>
<i>help-er</i>	<i>leach-er</i>	<i>steer-er</i>	<i>wait-er</i>
<i>buy-er</i>	<i>heal-er</i>	<i>cobbl-er</i>	<i>din-er</i>
<i>leap-er</i>	<i>los-er</i>	<i>teach-er</i>	<i>mov-er</i>
<i>fiddl-er</i>	<i>sell-er</i>	<i>hear-er</i>	<i>eat-er</i>
<i>rid-er</i>	<i>runn-er</i>	<i>sharp-er</i>	<i>rov-er</i>
<i>slumber-er</i>	<i>murder-er</i>	<i>slay-er</i>	<i>flatter-er</i>

All these—and many others can be added—give us both English roots and English affixes; to which it may be added that the root is a verb. It is a verb, even where it looks most like a noun; as in *harp-er*, *hatt-er*, *glov-er*, where *harp*, *hat*, and *glove* = *play on harp*, *make hats*, *make gloves*. It is a verb and an English verb. Let, however, the verb in question be of foreign origin, yet treated as if it were English. In this case we get words like *governor*, which are neither English nor French.

§ 286. Hybridism, and the inaccuracies of spelling to which it leads, are the chief points that command our attention with Feminines in *-ess*, and their corresponding Masculines. The minor details are of less importance.

Duch-ess, *count-ess*, *baron-ess*, *peer-ess*, *poet-ess*, *lion-*

ess.—Here *-ess* is attached, at once, to the main word, and the idea is that of a state, or condition, rather than action.

Empress.—Here one of the *r*'s in *Emper-or* is omitted. *Emperor* itself, however, is an anomalous word. The Latin is *Imperator*. Has the *-t* been lost? Or is the word an improper formation from *empire*? This is a point of French, rather than English, philology. Meanwhile, *Imperatrice* is direct from *Imperatrix*.

§ 287. The Masculine, in respect to *form*, is not always the correlative of the Feminine—thus *Marquis* will not give *Marchioness*, which comes from the Low Latin *Marchio*.

§ 288. In *seam-str-ess* and *song-str-ess* we find instances of hybridism, and something more. At present, however, it is enough to say that they are treated according to the analogy of *master* and *mistress*.

§ 289. Individually, I consider that hybridism is a *malum per se*, and that it ought to be discouraged; though, at the same time, I must admit that it is, sometimes, all but necessary; and also that some hybrids are better than others. When this is the case there is generally some combination of sounds which makes the word look more unilingual than it really is. In *witticism* (for instance) we have so close a parallel to *criticism* that the same analogy *appears* to apply to both. The classical scholar knows that it does not. He also knows that *w* is an impossible initial in a Greek word. Still, the word is better than many others. Again, let an English Verb end in *-t*. Let *-er* be added. Let a Feminine in *-ess* be required. The result will be a regular form in *-tress*. Hence, such a word as *waitress* (though beginning with *w*) is better than *foxess*, or *sheepess*.

§ 290. *The diminutive termination -et*.—Add *-et* to *lance*, and the result is *lanc-et* = *small lance*—a legitimate form,

because both the root and the affix are French. Add *-et* to *sword*, and the result (*sword-et* = *little sword*) is a specimen of hybridity. Still, there are many of these hybrid words which keep their ground, especially when the *-et* is preceded by *l*, as in *streamlet*.

§ 291. Words like *penetra-ble* and *penetra-bility*.—These are not only possible, but actual Latin words—*penetrabilis*, *penetrabilitas*. So are *possible* and *possibility*. So are *legible* and *legibility*. But *readable* and *bearable*, with their opposites, *un-readable* and *un-bearable*, are hybrid, and (to say the least) exceptionable.

§ 292. The terminations *-ize*, *-ist*, and *-ism*.—These are Greek, and in words like *ostracize* and *ostracism* they find a fit and proper place. In words of *English* origin they are exceptionable.

§ 293. Individually (to repeat what has been already stated), I consider that hybridism is a *malum per se*. It is often difficult, however, to avoid it. Many scientific terms err in this respect: exhibiting the heterogeneous juxtaposition of *more than one language*. Nor is this, in all cases, an accident. Occasionally it occurs through inadvertency: occasionally, however, it is defended. In a few cases it is the lesser of two evils. It is least blameworthy in words like the ones just quoted; words ending in *-ize*. It would be difficult to dispense with such words as *moralize*, *civilize*, and some others: however much the former part may be Latin, and however much the latter part may be Greek. Again—to words like *botanic*, where the *-ic* (like the *botan-*) is Greek, we may add the Latin *-al*. As such a word was possible in the Lower Empire, where such words as *πρωτονοτάριος* were common, we may call these (after the fashion of the architects) Byzantine formations. This, however, is only naming our tools. The mixture remains the same. At the same time one of the conditions required in the introduction of new words is

complied with. There exists a language in which they are possible. Generally, however, the actual occurrence of the *whole* word is impossible. Part comes from Language A : part from Language B : whilst in Language C, they are tacked together—something (as in words like *botanic-al-ly*) with additions.

§ 294. *Change of accent.*—A change of accent converts a Noun into a Verb. Walker has referred this to the action of the Participle.

<i>Substantive.</i>	<i>Verb.</i>	<i>Participle.</i>
Abstract	abstráct	abstrácting
Accent	accént	accénting
Affix	affix	affixing
Augment	augmént	augménting
Colléague	colléague	colléaguing
Compact	compáct	compácting
Compound	compóund	compóunding
Compress	compréss	compréssing
Concrete	concréte	concréting
Conflict	conflict	conflicting
Conserve	consérve	consérving
Consort	cousórt	consórting
Contrast	contrúst	contrústing
Converse	convérse	convérsing
Convert	convért	convérting
Désert	desért	desérting
Déscant	descánt	descánting
Digest	digést	digésting
Éssay	essáy	essáying
Éxtract	extráct	extrácting
Férment	fermént	ferménting
Fréquent	frequént	frequénting
Ímport	impórt	impórting
Íncense	insénse	insénsing
Ínsult	insúlt	insúlting
Óbject	objéct	objécting
Pérfume	perfúme	perfúming
Pérmit	permít	permítting
Préfix	prefix	prefixing
Prémise	premise	premissing
Présage	preságe	preságing
Présent	présént	présénting

<i>Substantive.</i>	<i>Verb.</i>	<i>Participle.</i>
Produce	produce	producing
Project	project	projecting
Protést	protést	protésting
Rébel	rebél	rebélling
Récord	recórd	recórding
Réfuse	refúse	refúsing
Súbject	subjéct	subjécting
Súrvey	survéy	survéying
Tórmént	tormént	torménting
Tránsfer	transfér	transferring
Tránsport	transpórt	transpórting.

None of these words are of English origin.

CHAPTER V.

DIMINUTIVES.

§ 295. *Diminutives*.—Compared with *lamb*, *man*, and *hill*, the words *lambkin*, *mannikin*, and *hillock*, convey the idea of smallness or diminution. In *hillock* there is the simple expression of comparative smallness in size. In *doggie* and *lassie* the addition of the *-ie* makes the word not so much a Diminutive as a term of tenderness. The idea of smallness, accompanied, perhaps, with that of neatness, generally carries with it that of approbation. *Clean* in English, means, in German, *little* = *kleine*. The feeling of protection, which is extended to small objects, engenders the notion of endearment.* Sometimes, a Diminutive is a term of disparagement; as *lordling* and *hireling*.

§ 296. Next to knowing that in some Diminutives there is *something more*, it is useful to know that in others

* As *klein* is to *clean* in German and English, so is *petitus* (*sought, desired*) to *petit* (*small*) in Latin and French.

there is something *less*, than the simple notion of smallness. This means that, in many cases, the Diminutive displaces the original word, and takes its place; but without being accompanied by the idea of diminution. Thus *sol*, in Latin = *sun*. But the Slavonic for *sun* is *slunce* = *little sun*, originally; now simply *sun*. The only word for *star* in Latin is *stella* = *ster-ula* = *little star*. The French for *sun* is *sol-eil* = *sol-illus* = *little sun*. In Italian *fratello* and *sor-ella* = *brother* and *sister* = *frater*, *soror*, without any idea of size. In the Lithuanic, where the Diminutives attain their *maximum*, we may meet such expression as *the big little-sun*.

§ 297. Taking the English and Scotch together, our Diminutives are numerous. Taking the English alone they are few. The first that come under notice are—

Form in -ck.—Common in Scotch; as *lassock*, *laddock*, *wifock*, *playock* (*plaything*) *buttock*, *haddock*, *sillock* (*fry of the coal fish*), with many others. In English (a) current—*bullock*, *hillock*, *buttock*; (b) archaic—*paddock* (*toad*); *mammoth* (*fragment*); (c) provincial—*emmock* (*emmet*), *dunnock* (*hedge-sparrow*), *ruddock* (*robin-red-breast*).

Forms in -ick—These are from the fuller forms in *-ock*; as *laddick*, *lassick*, *riddick* (*ruddock*), *sillick* (*sillock*), *emmeck* (*emmock*).

§ 298. To proceed: the older form of *apricot* is *abri-cock*. The older form of *brittle* is *brickle* (from *break*). With these preliminaries we may consider—

1. *Emmet* = *ant*. Compare *emmock* and *emmick*, as given above.

2. *Gobbet* = *piece, mouth-full*. In Scotch, *gappock*.

3. *Mammet*, same as *mammoth*.

4. *Gimlet*.—In Scotch, *gemlick*.

The evidence that the *-t* in these words represents *-k* is satisfactory. Professor Key, from whose valuable

paper the list (along with numerous other details) is taken, adds *cricket*, *hornet*, *limpet*, *locket*, *mallet*, *packet*, *pocket*, *sippit*, *smicket* (from *smock*), *tippet*, *wenet* (Somersetshire for *spider's web*), *ballot*, *spigot*. Here, however, the origin of the *-t* is uncertain. The local term *fitchet* = *polecat* has a better claim, inasmuch as there is another form *fitchew*, in which the origin of the *w* out of a *k* is nearly certain. *Brisket* and *maggot* are transpositions from *bristek* (from *breast*), and the A. S. *maðu* where a *k* or *g* precedes (as in *smock*).

Form in -ing.—*lord-ing*, *bird-ing*.

Form in -l.—*nozzle* (*nose*), *speckle* (*speck*), *spittle* (*spit*), *throstle* (*thrush*), *thimble* (*thumb*), *girdle*, *griddle* (*grid-iron*), *kernel* (*corn*), *gristle*, *knuckle*, *stubble*, *sparkle*.

Soare = a deer in its third year. *Sorr-el* = a deer in its second year.

Kantle = small corner, from *cant* = corner.

Hurdle; in Dutch, *horde*; German, *hurde*. *Hording*, without the *-l*, is used in an allied sense by builders in English.

§ 299. *Form in -ie.*—Scotch—*wifie*, *daddie*, *lassie*, *lambie*, *boatie*. English—*daädy*, *baby*.

§ 300. *Double Derivatives.*—(a) Forms of which the basis is *k*.

K + ie.—Scotch—*Lassockie*, *lassickie*, *wifockie*.

K + in.—This gives us the termination *-kin*, the commonest of our Diminutives, though by no means general. The following list is from a paper on English Diminutives in the Philological Museum (vol. i. pp. 679–686). *Mannikin*, *lambkin*, *pipkin* (= little pipe). *Gerkin* is from the root of *gourd* rather than from *gourd* itself; German, *gurke*; Norse, *gurka*.

Jerkin = frock. In Dutch, *jurk*.

Pumpkin.—Dutch, *pomp*. Obsolete in English.

Griskin = Little pig. *Gris* or *grice*. Obsolete.

Bumpkin.—Root *b-m*; Dutch, *boom* = *tree*, *beam*; in German *baum* = *tree*; in English *beam* (generally = the *trabs*, but preserved in *horn-beam*, with the power of *arbor*). The notion of *woodiness*, connected with stupidity, or extreme simplicity, is shown in the word *block-head*.

Firkin = Little fourth = Latin *quadrantulus*.

Lastly, we have in *lad-i-k-in*, *mann-i-k-in*, the combination $-i + k + n$.

§ 301. *Form with -l + ing*.—*Bant-l-ing*, *dar-l-ing*, *chitter-l-ing*, *duck-l-ing*, *first-l-ing*, *fond-l-ing*, *found-l-ing*, *kit-l-ing*, *nest-l-ing*, *star-l-ing* (*stare*), *sap-l-ing*, *seed-l-ing*, *strip-l-ing*, *suck-l-ing*, *wit-l-ing*, *year-l-ing*, and a few others. In *change-l-ing* and *nurse-l-ing*, the root is other than English. In *hire-l-ing*, *lord-l-ing*, and *wit-l-ing* the idea of diminution is accompanied by that of contempt.

§ 302. *Form in l + ock*.—In Professor Key's list I find, from Jamieson, and (as such) Scotch—*hump-l-ock* = *a small heap*, *knub-l-ock* = *a little knob*.

§ 303. *The combination let = l + et*.—Here the *-l* is German—common in the Swiss and Bavarian forms of speech—whilst the *-t* is either English or French, as the case may be. When English it is *-t* in *emmet*; i. e. a $t = k$; when French, the *-t* in *lancet*. When the latter, it gives us an instance of hybridism. In *gim-let* the affix seems to be English. In *ham-let*, *stream-let*, and *ring-let*, it is, probably, French.

§ 304. *The combination rel = r + el*. The analysis of *cockrel* (*cockerel*) and *pickerel* is *cock-er-el* and *pick-er-el*; but as the words *cocker* and *piker* have no independent existence, it is an unsatisfactory one. The nearest approach to a Diminutive of the kind is *fresher* = *young frog*, the A.-S. and O. E. forms for *frog* having been *frox* and *frosh* = German *frosch*.

CHAPTER VI.

AUGMENTATIVES.

§ 305. THE opposite to Diminutive is *Augmentative*, from the Latin *augmentum* = *increase*; Augmentatives being words by which the notion of excessive size is suggested. They are, by no means, so widely diffused over the domain of language as Diminutives; and, where they occur, they are less numerous. The Italian is, probably, the language which has the most of them. In the Italian, however the Diminutives (as has already been stated) are numerous also: so that there is no reason for believing that the two classes are in any inverse ratio to each other. Like the Diminutives, the Augmentatives have secondary meanings; and, as a general rule, the idea conveyed by them is anything but complimentary. Many of them are terms of disparagement; though some are quite indifferent. They are often sonorous words with a broad vowel: *e. g.*—*pontone, bassone, ballone, bragadoccio*; all of which have been introduced from the Italian language into our own.

The nearest approach to an Augmentative in the German languages is to be found in certain words in *-art*, or *-ard*; as *drunk-ard, stink-ard, lagg-ard, cow-ard, and bragg-art*.

In *wiz-ard* (*witch-ard*) superiority of size is made the distinctive character of the male, as opposed to the female, impostor: and *wizard*, like *gander*, is a word where the masculine form is fuller than the feminine; the general rule being that words like *duch-ess, peer-ess, &c.*, are derived from *duke, peer, &c.* The dealers, however, in witchcraft were chiefly women.

Bastard is *not* a word of this class; but one from a wholly different source.

Reynard = *fox* is from the proper name *Ruinhart*, *Reynold*, or *Rinaldo*.

Buzzard = the Latin *but-eo*, shows that the *-ard* is non-radical. *But-* is, apparently, the *put-*, in *putt-ock*, another name of the *Buteo*.

“Or find the partridge in the puttock’s nest.”

§ 306. *Swéetheart* with a single accent, and that on the first syllable, is one thing. *Swéet héart* with two accents at par is another. The difference between *two separate words* and *a single word made up of two* has been shown elsewhere; and the only question that now remains is whether *swéetheart* be an ordinary compound, or a derivative, like *upmost* and others, *i. e.* a derivative wearing the garb of a compound. It may be either. It may = *heart* + *sweet*, just as *bláck bird* = *bird* + *black*, or it may = *sweet* + *art* (as in *bragg-art*). In favour of this view is the German *liebhart*; a word with the same meaning. In the *Low-German* this would be a possible compound; inasmuch as, in *Low-German*, *hart* = *heart*. In *High-German*, however, the word is *herz*—and *herz* can scarcely give such a compound as *liebhart*.

§ 307. There is another word of this sort which requires notice: *i. e.* *true-love*. Adjective for adjective, *true* is as likely to precede the substantive *love*, as *faithful*, *charming*, &c., or any other word. Moore might as easily have written—

Then fare thee well, mine own true love—

as

Then fare thee well, mine own dear love,

though he did not. *Trúe love*, then, like *bláck bírd*, is a pair of words. But *true-love* (as in *trúelove’s knot*) is a

compound. Of what? Perhaps of *love* preceded by *true*; in which case it is a word like *bláckbird*. Perhaps of something else. In Danish, *trolove* = *to betroth* and *trovoled* = a *betrothed* or *engaged* person. - Meanwhile *lov* = *law*, and has nothing to do with the tender passion. Upon this Mr. Laing, in his well-known work upon Norway, remarks that the words have no origin in the affections, and that “a man may be a *true lover* to his bond of ten pounds, as well as to his sweetheart.” He goes further, and holds that the word *love* itself = *amo* has the same legal character: in which, however, he is wrong—as may be seen from the German *liebe*, and the Latin *lub-et*. Laying this, however, out of the question, it is clear that, if the first part of this doctrine be right, we have, in *trúelove*, not only a curious derivative, but a word of Scandinavian origin. And such I once believed it to be. Where, however, is the evidence of its meaning *an engaged person* in English? Until this be adduced it is better to suspend judgment.

CHAPTER VII.

PATRONYMICS AND GENTILE NAMES.

§ 308. IN Anglo-Saxon the termination *-ing* is as truly patronymic as *-ides* is in Greek. In the Bible-translation the son of Elisha is called *Elising*. In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle occur such genealogics as the following:—*Ida wæs Eopping, Eoppa Esing, Esa Inging, Inga Angenwiting, Angenwit Alocing, Aloc Beonocing, Beunoc Branding, Brand Bældæging, Bældag Wóðering, Wóden Friðowulf-*

ing, *Friðowulf Finning*, *Finn Godwulfing*, *Godwulf Geat-ing* = Ida was the son of Eōppa, Eoppa of Esa, Esa of Inga, Inga of Angenwit, Angenwit of Aloc, Aloc of Beonoc, Beonoc of Brand, Brand of Bældag, Bældag of Woden, Woden of Friðowulf, Friðowulf of Finn, Finn of Godwulf, Godwulf of Gcat.—In Greek, this would be "Ἰδᾶ ἡν' Εοππείδης, "Εοππα 'Ησειδης, "Ησα 'Ιγγείδης, "Ιγγα 'Αγγενφίτειδης, &c. In like manner, Edgar *Atheling* means *Edgar of the family of the nobles*.

The plurals of these forms in *-ing* have commanded attention from their prominence in the Anglo-Saxon charters, as the names of *places*. Through the *Codex Diplomaticus* we learn that the following districts (along with many others) of which the names now end in the simple singular syllable *-ing*, originally, ended in the plural form *-ing-as*. Thus—

Barking	in	Essex	was	Berceingas
Bocking	—	Essex	—	Boccingas.
Ditchling	—	Sussex	—	Dicelingas.
Docking	—	Norfolk	—	Doccingas.
Malling	—	Kent	—	Mallingas
Reading	—	Berks	—	Readingas.
Tarring	—	Sussex	—	Terringas.

These, with others, are (as has been stated) names which actually occur in A. S. documents. In the following, the forms in *-as* are inferred from the present names.

Balking	in	Essex from a hypothetical	Balcingas.
Barling	—	Essex	— Beorlingas.
Barming	—	Kent'	— Beormingas.
Basing	—	Hants	— Basingas.
Belting	—	Kent	— Beltingas.
Billing	—	Norths, &c.	— Billingas.
Birling	—	Northumberland	— Birlingas.
Brading	—	Hants	— Bradingas.

and so on throughout the alphabet. In a few cases,

however, the *-as*, in the form *-s*, is retained at the present time, *e. g.* :—

Barlings	in	Lincolnshire.
Bealings	—	Suffolk.
Hastings	—	Sussex.
Lillings	—	Yorkshire.

§ 309. Can these plurals, real and hypothetical, be the names of the men and women who occupied certain districts rather than the names of the districts themselves? Yes. The nature of the word *Wales** may be seen in § 8; but it is only one word out of many; the transfer of the name of the inhabitants to the land inhabited being common both in A.-S. and Old English. Again, in Lithuanic—

Szvėdai, <i>Swedes</i>	from	Szvėdas, <i>a Swede</i>	= <i>Sweden</i> .
Prūsai, <i>Prussians</i>	—	Prūsas, <i>a Prussia</i>	= <i>Prussia</i> .
Lėnkai, <i>Poles</i>		Lėnkas, <i>a Pole</i>	= <i>Poland</i> .

In *Cornwall*, the *✓ w-l* is singular; as it, also, is in the following passage :—

“Pis tiping com him how *Wale* him betrayed
Perfor is Gascoyn left and er at werre delayed.”

ROB. BR. 263.

The older name for England is *Engle* = *Angles*, rather than *Anglia*.

“The Denes adde the maȝstre, tho al was do :
And by *Est Angle* and Lyndeseȝe hii wende vorp atte laste,
And so hamward al by Kent and slow and barnde vaste.”

ROB. GLOU. 160.

To proceed. *Norfolk* and *Suffolk* are the *people* (*folk*) of the North and South, the use of *f-lk* as the part of a local name being particularly common in the Norse.

* Our *wall-nuts* have nothing to do with *walls*. They are *foreign nuts*; *Weish nuts*, or *nucēs Gallicæ*.

Sus-sex, and *Ess-ex* are the South Saxons, and the East Saxons rather than South, or East, Saxony.

Somer-set, and *Dor-set* are words of the same kind; meaning *Somer-settlers* and *Dor-settlers*—the A.-S. form having been *sæta* = *incola*, with a plural both in *-as*, and *-an*. In the *Codex Diplomaticus* we have—

Beonotsætan	in	Worcestershire	M6setan	in	Worcestershire
Bráðsetan	—	ditto	Wreocensetan	—	Shropshire
Grimsetan	—	ditto	Crægsetan	—	Kent
Incsetan	—	ditto	Crudsetan	—	Wilts

§ 310. The total number of different names, either real or inferred, which end in *-ing*, is, as Mr. Kemble writes, 627; but, as several of them are repeated in different counties, the sum total amount to 1329, distributed thus:—

Yorkshire	127	Berks	22
Norfolk	97	Nottingham	22
Lincolnshire	76	Cambridge	21
Sussex	68	Dorset	21
Kent	60	Stafford	19
Suffolk	56	Durham	19
Northumberland	48	Leicester	19
Essex	48	Surrey	18
Gloster	46	Bucks	17
Somerset	45	Hunts	16
Northampton	35	Derby	14
Salop	34	Worcester	13
Hants	33	Middlesex	12
Warwick	31	Hertford	10
Oxford	31	Cumberland	6
Lancashire	26	Rutland	4
Wilts	25	Westmoreland	2
Cheshire	25	Cornwall	2
Devon	24	Monmouth	0
Bedford	22		

§ 311. In respect to the names like *Tarring*, &c., which stand alone, or without the additions of *-wic*, *-ham*,

-worth, *-borough*, and the like, their distribution is as follows:—

Kent . .	25	Hunts . .
Norfolk . .	24	Northumberland
Sussex . .	24	Notts . .
Essex . .	21	Cambridge .
Suffolk . .	15	Derby . .
York . .	13	Dorset . .
Lincoln . .	7	Gloucester .
Southampton	6	Oxon . .
Berks . .	5	Bucks . .
Surrey . .	5	Devon . .
Beds . .	4	Salop . .
Norths . .	4	Leicester .
Lancashire .	4	Somerset .
Middlesex .	4	Warwick .
Herts . .	3	Wilts . .

§ 312. Supposing these words to be declined like *cyning* = *king*, their possessive case would be, in the singular number, (*say*) *Malling-es*, in the plural, *Malling-a*. If so, the *town* of *Malling*, or, of a *Malling* would be *Mallingestún*; the *town* of the *Mallings* being *Mallingatún*. But what would *Mallingtun* be? This question is anything but unimportant. In the *Codex Diplomaticus* (No. 179), Mr. Kemble finds an *Æðelwulfing land*; also (No. 195), a *Folcwining land*; also (*ibid.*), a *Wynhearding land*; upon which he remarks that this means the land of an *Æthelwulf*, a *Folwine*, and a *Wynheard*; rather than that of a family called *Æthelwulfings*, a family called *Folcwinings*, or a family called *Wynheardings*. From this, he argues that the termination *-ing* is, by no means, sufficient, in all cases, to make a patronymic, but that, on the contrary, it sometimes denotes a genitive, or possessive, case—*Æthelwulfing land* being exactly equivalent to *Æthelwulfes land*. In like manner *Woolbedington*, *Wool Lavington*, and *Barlavington* are, respectively, *Wulfbædingtún*, *Wulfláfigntún*, and *Beórlafigntún*, or the

towns of (*túnas*) of Wulfbæd, Wulfláf, and Beórlaf.— See *Saxons in England*, vol. i. p. 60, note.

The view that *-ing* is virtually a genitive case, is further developed in a paper by the same author in the *Philological Transactions* (vol. iv.). Objected to by Mr. Watts, who holds that the form is adjectival rather than genitive, this doctrine has been endorsed by Professor Key.

§ 313. The notion that *-ing* is the sign of a genitive case in the way that *-s* is one, I hold to be untenable; and I doubt whether the author meant to say that it was so. Wallis calls all our forms in *-s* adjectives, on the strength of the import of a *good hat* and a *man's hat* being, as far as the relations of *good* and *man's* to *hat* are concerned, the same. Yet, he would never have said that *hominis* was in the same category with *bonus*, or *bonus* in the same category as *hominis*, except in a very general way. That the ideas expressed by the words patronymic and genitive are allied no one doubts—and, it seems to me, that Mr. Kemble meant little more than this. Without laying undue stress upon the paucity of examples, and arguing that a final *-a*, the sign of the genitive plural, may have been omitted by either the speaker or the copyist, we may fairly say that the power under notice is exceptional. If so, all that can be said is that in a few instances such words as *Æthelwulfing land*=either *terra Æthelwulfii*, or *terra Æthelwulfiana*. For making the forms *exclusively* genitive, I see as few reasons as I see for making them *exclusively* adjectival. They are neither one nor the other exactly; any more than *Priamides* is *exactly* either *Priami* or *Priameius*.

§ 314. So much for the purely etymological question. The historical aspect of the question is, at least, of equal interest. If phrases like *Wulfláfingtún*=*Wulfláf's town*, we have a great number of large places founded by

single individuals. I do not say that such is not the case. In many cases—especially in the Danish parts of England—the undeniable sign of the genitive case (*-s*) comes between a personal proper name and a local common one, *e. g.* in *Ingoldsby, Ormskirk, &c.* = *Ingialld's town, Orm's Church, &c.* Upon the whole, however, I favour the inference suggested by the numerous plural forms in *-ingas*, and believe that the ordinary Patronymic power is the one which best suits the form. The question, however, is far too complicated for a work like the present.

CHAPTER VIII.

ABSTRACTS.—FORMS IN *-TH*.—FORMS IN *-NESS*.

§ 315. PROPER Abstracts are of two kinds (*a*) Determinate and (*b*) Indeterminate.

§ 316. The Determinate Abstracts denote qualities *to the exclusion of their opposites*. They fall into two divisions; in the first of which the Adjective is simple; in the second of which it is either Derivative or Compound.

§ 317. *Adjective Simple*.—Words like *long, broad, high, deep, strong, hot*, to which *short, narrow, low, shallow, weak, cold* stand in contrast, run in pairs, as—*high, low; broad, narrow, &c.* In these each adjective can take the termination *-ness*; in other words, we can say both *long-ness* and *short-ness, broad-ness* and *narrow-ness, high-ness* and *low-ness, deep-ness* and *shallow-ness, strong-ness* and *weak-ness, hot-ness* and *cold-ness*—at least, good authorities have done so. At the same time, it is

clear that there is a difference; this difference being in favour of the more *negative* term of the two. Thus:—

Short-ness	is commoner than	Long-ness.
Narrow-ness	—	Broad-ness.
Low-ness	—	High-ness.
Shallow-ness	—	Deep-ness.
Weak-ness	—	Strong-ness.
Cold-ness	—	Hot-ness.

§ 318. If there be any exception to this statement it lies with the word *highness*, which is, perhaps, commoner than *lowness*. It should, however, be remembered that it has two meanings—being used as a title of honour, as *your Royal Highness*. On the other hand, *longness* and *strongness* are words which a very fastidious writer would hesitate about using. And, unless he gave them their right meaning, he would do well in abstaining from them.

§ 319. *Second division.*—*Adjective Derived* (a) *Derivative element -y*—*Happi-ness, un-happiness, naughti-ness.*

(b) *Derivative element -ish*—*slugg-ish-ness, peev-ish-ness.*

(c) *Participial forms in -ed*—*content-ed-ness.*

§ 320. *Adjective Compound.*—(a) Words in *-ly* = *like* *world-li-ness, man-li-ness.*

(b) Words in *-ful*—*truth-ful-ness.*

(c) Words in *-less*—*ruth-less-ness, care-less-ness.*

§ 321. The Indeterminate Abstracts denote qualities, but *without excluding their opposites*. Thus, we may talk of *the length of a very short walk—the height of a low chair—the depth of a shallow stream*, and the like. In all these cases we merely mean that the *walk*, the *chair*, and the *water* have a certain amount of extension in a certain direction. Whether this be little or much is another matter. We mention it generally. If we wished to draw attention to the fact of the three qualities being *be-*

low the average we should say *short-ness*, *low-ness*, and *shallow-ness*.

§ 322. The Indeterminate Abstracts, in the typical form, are formed from Adjectives by the addition of *-th*. As this, however, is a simple consonant, it creates no new syllable. As it attaches itself directly to the Adjective (the Adjective itself generally ending in a consonant) it creates some slight euphonic modifications. Thus :—

In *strong* and *long* the vowel changes, after the manner of the *o* in *old* and *elder*, and the result is *streng-th*, *leng-th*.

So it does in *broad*, giving *bread-th*, pronounced *bred-th*. Here the affinity between the sounds of *-d* and *-th* gives us a near approach of a true reduplication of a consonant.

In *height*, the power of the *h* is often overlooked, and the word is sounded *height*.

In *depth* the opposite often occurs, and many say *defth* on the principle that, in the Greek language, gives us such forms as *τυφθεις*.

§ 323. With the forms in *-th*, the phenomenon of § 317 is reversed, and words like *short-th*, *narrow-th*, *loss-th*, *cold-th*, are either rare or non-existent: in other words, the *negative* terms take the form in *-ness*.

CHAPTER IX.

ON CERTAIN FORMS IN *-ER*.—DEGREES OF COMPARISON.—
DEFECT AND COMPLEMENT.

§ 324. PREPARATORY to the consideration of the degrees of comparison, we must attend to certain phenomena connected with the forms in *-er*; an ending which is common to (1) certain pronouns, as *ei-th-er*, *n-ei-th-er*, *whe-th-er*,

o-th-er; (2) certain prepositions and adverbs, as *ov-er*, *und-er*, *af-t-er*; (3) adjectives of the comparative degree; as *wis-er*, *strong-er*, *bett-er*, &c.; (4) adjectives, with the form of the comparative, but the power of the positive, degree; as *upp-er*, *und-er*, *inn-er*, *out-er*, *hind-er*. What is the idea common to all these words? Bopp, who has best generalized the view of the form, considers the fundamental idea to be that of *duality*. In the comparative degree we have a relation between one object and *some* other object like it, or a relation between two single elements of comparison: as *A is wiser than B*. In the superlative degree we have a relation between one object and *all* others like it, or a relation between one single and one complex element of comparison: *A is wiser than B, C, D, &c.* Over and above, however, the idea of simple comparison, there is that of (1) contrariety; as in *inner*, *outer*, *under*, *upper*, *over*; and (2) choice in the way of an alternative; as *either*, *neither*, *other*, and *whether*, a word which, as a pronoun, is nearly obsolete. No one at present says *whether of the two will you have*, or *whether of the two is this?* but, on the contrary, *which of the two*, &c. In Lithuanic, the converse takes place, and *whether* (at least its equivalent *katras*) applies to more than two, *e. g.* :—

Trīs bernjczai szėno pióve ;
Katras búsit máno mėlās ?
Katras plauksit vainikėlio ?

i. e. *Three* young men mow hay ;
Whether (which) will be my love ?
Whether (which) will swim for the wreath ?

The word, as is suggested by this quotation, is an old one; being the Latin *uter* (*c-uter*, whence *n-euter* = *n-either*) and the Greek *κότερος* (= *πότερος*).

§ 325. The notice of the extent to which the notion of comparison is connected with that of duality is not the

only preliminary to the consideration of what are called the positive, comparative, and superlative degrees of adjectives and adverbs. A distinction, important elsewhere, is pre-eminently important here. This is *the distinction between a sequence in logic and a sequence in etymology*. The ideas or notions of *thou, thy, thee*, are ideas between which there is a metaphysical or logical connection. The train of such ideas may be said to form a sequence, and such a sequence may be called a logical one. The forms *thou, thy, thee*, are forms or words between which there is a formal or an etymological connection. A train of such words may be called a sequence, and such a sequence may be called an etymological one. In the case of *thou, thy, thee*, the etymological sequence tallies with the logical one. In the case of *I, my, me*, the etymological sequence does *not* tally (or tallies imperfectly) with the logical one. Applying this to words like *good, better, &c.*, we see, at once, that, whilst some are deficient in their Comparative and Superlative, others are deficient in their Positive, forms. The *defective* character, however, of this class of words is not all. It must be remarked that the forms which one word wants are made good by those which another possesses. Hence, there is not only *defect*, but what may be called *complement* also. The word *good* fills up what was wanting to the forms *better* and *best*.

That the phenomena of defect and complement will meet us again when we reach the pronouns is suggested by the example just given. It will meet us elsewhere besides. It will meet us most especially amongst the verbs.

CHAPTER X.

FORMATION OF THE COMPARATIVE DEGREE.—DETAILS.

§ 326. THE comparative is formed from the positive by adding *-er*; as *cold*, *rich*, *dry*—*cold-er*, *rich-er*, *dry-er*. This *-r* was, originally, *-s*. (See § 330.)

§ 327. *Details*.—In *worse* we may suppose that there is a remnant of this: the Mæso-Gothic form being *váirsiza*; in Old High-German, *wirsiro*; Middle High-German, *wirser*; Old Saxon, *wirso*; Anglo-Saxon, *vyrsa*; Old Norse, *vërri*; Danish, *værre*; and Swedish, *värre*.

Near, *nearer*.—A. S. *neah*; comparative, *nearre*, *near*, *nyr*; superlative, *nyhst*, *nehst*. Observe, the absence of the *r*. This shows that the English positive *near* is the Anglo-Saxon comparative *nearre*, and that in the secondary comparative *nearer*, we have an excess of expression. In the vulgarism *betterer* for *better*, and in the antiquated forms *worser* for *worse*, and *lesser* for *less*, we have an excess of expression. In the Old High-German we have the forms *betsërôro*, *mêrôro*, *êrërëra* = *better*, *more*, *ere*. It may be, however, that the *r* in *near* is a mere point of orthography, and that it is not pronounced; just as *father* and *farther* are, for the most part, pronounced alike.

Farther.—Anglo-Saxon, *feor*, *fyrre*, *fyrrest*. The *th* seems euphonic, inserted by the same process that gives the *ð* in *áðroq*.

Further.—Confounded with *farther*, although in reality from a different word, *fore*. Old High-German, *furdîr*; New High-German, *der vordere*; Anglo-Saxon, *fyrðre*.

CHAPTER XI.

FORMATION OF THE SUPERLATIVE DEGREE.—DETAILS.

§ 328. THE superlative degree is formed from the positive by the addition of the syllable *-est* ; as *dark, dark-est* ; *cold, cold-est* ; *rich, rich-est* ; *dry, dry-est* ; *low, low-est*.

§ 329. But it may also be formed from the comparative by changing the *r* of the comparative into *s*, and adding *t* ; as *dark-er, dark-es, dark-es-t* ; *cold-er, cold-es, cold-es-t* ; *rich-er, rich-es, rich-es-t* ; *dry-er, dry-es, dry-es-t* ; *low-er, low-es, low-es-t*.

§ 330. To understand the reason why this complex and apparently unnecessary process has been noticed, we must remember what has been said concerning the Mæso-Gothic language, and the extent to which it preserves the *older* forms of the Gothic inflections ; and, also, that the Mæso-Gothic Comparative was not formed in *r*, but in *s*. *Ald-iza, bat-iza, sut-iza*, were the original forms of what became in Old High-German *alt-iro, betsi-iro, suats-iro*, and in English, *old-er, bett-er, sweet-er*. This is one fact. Another is, that *whilst many languages have a Comparative without a Superlative degree, few or none have a Superlative without a Comparative*. Hence, in the case of a Superlative in *-st*, two views may be taken. According to the one, it is the Positive with the addition of *st* ; according to the other, it is the old Comparative in *-s* with the addition only of *t*. Now, Grimm, and others, lay down as a rule, that the Superlative is formed, not *directly* from the *Positive*, but *indirectly* through the *Comparative*.

§ 331. With the exception of *worse* and *less*, all the English Comparatives end in *r* ; yet no Superlative ends in *rt*, the form being, not *wise, wiser, wisert*, but *wise*,

wiser, wisest. This fact, without invalidating the notion just laid down, gives additional importance to the Comparative forms in *s*; since it is from these, *before* they changed to *r*, that we must suppose the Superlatives to have been derived. This theory being admitted, we can, by approximation, determine the date of the Superlative degree. It was introduced into the languages allied to the English, *after* the establishment of the Comparative and before the change of *s* into *r*.

§ 332. Of the English superlatives, the only ones that demand a detailed examination, are those that are generally despatched without difficulty, viz. the words in *most* such as *midmost, foremost, &c.* The current view is that they are compound words, formed from simple ones, by the addition of the superlative term *most*. Grimm's view is opposed to this. In appreciating this, we must bear in mind the phenomena of *excess of expression*; at the same time we must not depart from the current theory without duly considering that we have in Icelandic the forms *nærmeir, fjærmeir, &c.*, *nearer* and *farther*, most unequivocally compounded of *near + more* and of *far + more*. The A. S. gives us the following forms:—

<i>Anglo-Saxbn.</i>	<i>English.</i>	<i>Anglo-Saxon.</i>	<i>English.</i>
innema	inmost	forma	foremost.
uteina	outmost	æftema	aftermost.
siðema	latest	ufema	utmost.
lætema	latest	hindema	hindmost.
niðema	nethermost	midema	midmost.

Besides these, there are in the other allied languages, words like *furma=first, aftuma=last, miduma=middle*. These words show at once, that, as far as they are concerned, the *m* which appears in the last syllable of each has nothing to do with the word *most*. On the contrary, there was formed, in Anglo-Saxon, a regular superlative

from them by the addition of *st*; as *æfte-m-est*, *fyr-m-est*, *læte-m-est*, *sið-m-est*, *yfe-m-est*, *ute-m-est*. And, hence, in the present English, the different parts of the syllable *most* (in words like *upmost*), come from different quarters. The *m* is the *m* in the Anglo-Saxon words *innema*, &c.; whilst the *-st* is the common sign of the superlative. In separating, then, such words as *midmost* into its component parts, we should write—

mid-m-ost	not	mid-most	fore-m-ost	not	fore-m
ut-m-ost	—	ut-most	in-m-ost	—	in-most.
up-m-ost	—	up-most	hind-m-ost	—	hind-most.

§ 333. In certain words the syllable *m-ost* is added to a word already ending in *er*; that is, to a word already marked with the sign of the comparative degree.

neth-er-most	hind-cr-most.
utt-er-most	out-er-most.
upp-er-most	inn-er-most.

Here, the addition is *most*, as a simple word; and the result is a *Compound*—not a *Derivative*.

Having accounted for the *m* in the words just mentioned, we can account for the *m* in the word *former*. The superlative was *forma*; and *former* was a comparative, catachrestically, derived from it.

CHAPTER XII.

COMPARISON OF ADVERBS.

§ 334. *Comparison of Adverbs*.—Adverbs, like adjectives, take degrees of comparison, though not to the same extent. In *the sun shines bright*, the word *bright* means *brightly*; and although the use of the latter word would

have been the more elegant, the expression is not ungrammatical.

The sun shines to-day brighter than it did yesterday, and to-morrow it will shine brightest.—Here also the sense is adverbial.

In words like *oftener* and *seldomer* the adverbial comparison is beyond doubt.

§ 335. Adverbs, then, take the degrees of comparison: and not only do they do this, but the history of their forms is important. In *Anglo-Saxon* there were *two* forms; one in *-re* and *-este*, the other in *-or* and *-ost*. Now the first of these was the form taken by adjectives; as *se scearpre sweord* = *the sharper sword*, and *se scearpeste sweord* = *the sharpest sword*: the second, the form taken by adverbs; as, *se sweord scyrð scearpor* = *the sword cuts sharper*, and *se sweord scyrð scearpost* = *the sword cuts sharpest*.

§ 336. More than this—the adverbial form had a tendency to make the preceding vowel full: the adjectival, a tendency to make it small. Thus—

<i>Positive.</i>	<i>Comparative.</i>	<i>Superlative</i>	
Lang,	Lengre,	Lengest,	<i>Long.</i>
Strang,	Strengre,	Strengest,	<i>Strong.</i>
Geong,	Gyngre,	Gyngest,	<i>Young.</i>
Sceort,	Scytte,	Scyrtest,	<i>Short.</i>
Heáh,	Hyrre,	Hylst,	<i>High.</i>
Eald,	Yldre,	Yldest,	<i>Old.</i>

Of this change, the word last quoted is a still-existing specimen, as *old*, *elder*, and *older*, *eldest* and *oldest*. Between the two forms, however, there is a difference in meaning, *elder* being used as a substantive, and having a plural form, *elders*. This, however, is by the way. A more important word is *rather*: in which we pronounce the *a* like the *a* in *father*, or full. Nevertheless, the positive form is small, the *a* being pronounced as the

a in *fate*, or *small*. The word itself means *quick*, *easy*= the classical root *pad-* in *padios*. What we do *quickly* and *willingly* we do *by preference*. If the word *rather* were an adjective, the vowel of the comparative would be sounded as the *a* in *fate*. As it is, however, it is adverbial, and as such is properly sounded full.

CHAPTER XIII.

ON THE ORDINALS.—WHAT IS THE CONNEXION BETWEEN THE ORDINALS AND THE DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

§ 337. THE Ordinals are derived from the Cardinals. There is, however, no *etymological* connection between either *one* and *first*, or *two* and *second*. With the others the ordinal form is either *th* or a modification of it. Thus—

<i>Cardinal.</i>					<i>Ordinal.</i>
Three	Thir- <i>d</i> .
Four	Four- <i>th</i> .
Five	Fif- <i>th</i> .
Six	Six- <i>th</i> .
Eight	Eigh- <i>th</i> .

And so on.

§ 338. Is there any connection between the Ordinals of Numerals and the Superlatives of Adjectives? It is an undoubted fact that more than one form is common to certain Superlatives, and to certain Ordinals. Thus the *-m-* in *for-m-er*, of which the Anglo-Saxon is *for-m-a*, and which is, in Latin, *pri-m-us*, and, in Lithuanic, *pir-m-as*, is, without doubt, the *-m-* in *infi-m-us*, *exti-m-us*, &c. = *lowest*, *outermost*, &c.; all being superlatives. It is also

an undoubted fact that the *-t-* in *sex-t-us* (*sixth*) is the *-t-* in *πρω-τος*, and the *-tim-* in *sep-tim-us*, the *tim* of *ex-tim-us*. It is impossible to see these coincidences without admitting the possibility of such identifications. Those, however, who see this are asked to see more. They are asked to see in the Greek form *-τατ-*, and *φιλ-τατ-ος* an original *-ταμτ-* in which both the *-τ-* and *-μ-* once existed. They are then asked to see, in a word like *πρω-τος*, a form in which *-μ-* is lost, but the *-τ-* preserved. They are then asked to see in *infi-mus*, a form where the *-t-* is preserved, but without the *-μ-*.

§ 339. All this passes within the region of the Superlative Degree, and without any hypothesis as to the affinity between the ideas of Superlativity and Ordinality. But what if the latter be superadded? In this case, the Ordinals are dealt with as Superlatives, and, *mutatis mutandis*, the reasoning is repeated. The *-tim-* in *sep-tim-us* is the full, perfect, and typical form; the *-t-* in *quar-t-us*, the *-t-* minus *m-*. The *-m-* in *deci-m-us* is the *-m-* minus *t-*: all this within the compass of one language. But this is not all; the Latin for 7 is *septem*, the Greek *ἑπτα*. The Norse for 7 is *sjau*. But, in the English, in *seven*, the *-n-* (being the *-m-* of the ordinal) is reflected back (so to say) on the cardinal. This may, or may not, be the case. But there is more behind. The Greek for 10 is *δεκα*; wherein, not only the *-t-* but the *-m-* is lost also; as may be seen from *dec-em*. But the English for 10 is *ten*; in Mæso-Gothic *taihun*. Here the *-h-* = *-k-* (in *δεκα*), and *-c-* (in *decem*); whilst the *-n-* = *-m-* in *septi-m-us* = *-m-* in *infi-m-us* = *-m-* in *pri-m-us* = *-m-* of the Superlative Degree = *-m-* of ordinality—this *-m-* of ordinality being reflected on the Superlative. The same applies to *seven* and *nine*. The *-n-* is not radical, as is inferred from *sjau*, and *ἑννεα*:

and it *is* ordinal, as is inferred from *septi-m-us* and *novi-m-us* = *nonus*. All this should be known, because it is found in the writings of authoritative grammarians. But is it true? I cannot say. It explains so much that I am slow to believe it wholly wrong. At the same time the patent and ostensible argument in favour of it is unsatisfactory. To treat *first* as the ordinal of *two*, is like treating *I* as the nominative of *me*. They are not only two words but the names for two different ideas. *First* is a superlative all the world over. It is at the most honourable end of a series, or order; and, as such, Ordinal. But this order, in which it is ~~so~~ superlative, is not represented by *one*, but by *second*, *third*, *fourth*, and so on. In respect to these it is both ordinal and superlative. What it is to *one* is another matter. It is certainly *not* its superlative.

§ 340. To proceed. Compare *second* with *two*, and what is the correlation? None. The true correlative to *second* is *first*; and as *second* is from the Latin *secundus*, to which the root is the *sec-* in *seq-uor*, the two together mean, there or thereabouts, the *preceding* and the *following*. If any degree of comparison comes in here, it is the *comparative*; and that this *does* come in is shown in those languages which, like the Danish, use *anden* = *other* for *second*.

§ 341. Notwithstanding all this, it is possible that, in words like *third*, *fourth*, &c., some idea of superlativeness may exist, though not to the extent to which it exists in *first*. When we say the *fifth*, or the *sixth*, we use the definite article just as we do when we say *the best*, or *the worst*. We also imply that a number of objects is spoken about; inasmuch as *the fifth* implies the *fourth*, *third*, *second* and *first* which preceded it—the highest number being at the head of the series. In this there are the elements of ordinality of some kind. But is it the ordi-

nality that implies a cardinality? Is it a correlation between *fifth* and *five*? No. The ordinals, from *two*, upwards, are ordinal to *each other*, and not to their so called cardinals.

CHAPTER XIV.

EXPRESSION OF DIFFERENCE OF SEX.—DERIVATIVES IN -IN AND -STER.

§ 342. *Forms in -in.*—The chief affix by which the name of a male is converted into that of a female, is, in German *-in*; so that from *freund* = *friend* we get *freund-inn* = *female-friend*. It is a termination which is not only German but Sarmatian also: the Lithuanic giving

Bajóras	nobleman	bajor-ėnė.
Kūnigs	parson	kunig-ėnė.
Kūrpis	shoemaker	kurpiuv-ėnė.
Avýmas	mother's brother	avýn-ėnė (<i>his wife</i>).
Ásilas	ass	asil-ėnė.
Gàndras	stork	gandr-ėnė, &c., &c.

This being the case, its absence in English is remarkable. The only word in which it is believed to exist at the present moment is *vixen* = *female fox* = *fuchsinn*, German. I am, however, by no means certain that the word is not of recent introduction. If so, it is in the same predicament as *margravine* and *landgravine* from *march-grave*, and is merely a naturalized German word. That the *-ine* in *hero-ine*, from *hero*, has a wholly different origin is manifest; being from the Greek *ἡρώειν*.

§ 343. *Forms in -ster.*—Forms in *-ster* were originally the names of Females. The old glossaries give us—

(1.)

Textor	webba	Citharedus	hearpere
Textrix	webbestre	Citharista	hearpestre

(2.)

Cantor	sangere	Fidicen	fidelere
Cantrix	sangestre	Fidicina	fidel stre
Lector	rædere	Sartor	seamere
Lectrix	rædistre	Sartix	seamestre

(3.)

Hec pectrix,	a kempster	Hec siccatrix,	a dryster
— textrix,	a webster	— palmaria,	a brawdster
— pistrix,	a baxter	— salinaria,	a salster
— pandoxatrix,	a brewster	— auxiliatrix,	a hukster

On the other hand, such entries as

Hic pistor,	a backstare	Hic textor	a webster
-------------	-------------	------------	-----------

are very rare.

At present, however, *spinster* is the only representative of what was originally a large class. The words *songstress* and *seamstress*, besides being (as far as concerns the intermixture of languages) in the predicament of *shepherdess*, have a double Derivational element; 1st, *-str*, of Germanic, 2nd, *-ess*, of classical, origin.

§ 344. *Goose, gander*.—In the older forms of the word *goose*, such as $\chi\eta\nu$, Greek; *anser*, Latin; *gans*, German; as well as in the derived form *gander*, we have the proofs that, originally, there belonged to the word the sound of the letter *n*. In the forms $\delta\delta\omega\nu\varsigma$, $\delta\delta\omega\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$, Greek; *dens*, *dentis*, Latin; *zahn*, German; *tooth*, English, we find the analogy that accounts for the ejection of the *n*, and the lengthening of the vowel preceding. With respect, however, to the *d* in *gander*, it is not easy to say whether it is inserted in one word or omitted in the other. Neither can we give the precise power of the *-er*. The following forms occur in the different Gothic dialects.—*Gans*, *ganazzo*; Old High-German—*gôs*, f.; *gandra*, m., Anglo-Saxon—*gås*, Icelandic, f.; *gaas*, Danish, f.; *gasi*, Icelandic, m.; *gasse*, Danish, m.—*gänser*, *ganserer*, *gansart*, *gander*, and *gänserich*, in different New German

dialects. From § 342, we learn that the word under notice is Lithuanic for a *stork*.

§ 345. *Drake*.—The form *gänserich* has just been quoted. *Täuberich*, in provincial German, has the same form and the same power. It denotes a *male*—*taube*, in German, signifying a *dove*. Of the termination *-rik* we have a remnant, in English, preserved in the curious word *drake*. To *duck* the word *drake* has no etymological relation whatsoever. It is connected with a word with which it has but one letter in common; viz. the Latin *anas* = a *duck*. Of this the root is *anat-*, as seen in the genitive case *anatis*. In Old High-German we find the form *anetrëkho* = a *drake*; in provincial New High-German there is *enterich* and *äntrecht*, from whence come the English and Low-German form *drake*.

§ 346. *Peacock, peahen, bridegroom*.—In these compounds (as has already been stated), it is not the words *pea* and *bride* that are rendered masculine or feminine by the addition of *cock*, *hen*, and *groom*, but it is the words *cock*, *hen*, and *groom* that are modified by prefixing *pea* and *bride*. They are, however, instances of composition, rather than derivation; as, indeed, were *gänserich*, *täuberich*, and *enterich*.

§ 347. As a general rule, the names of females are derived from those of males; however, *wizard*, *gander*, and *drake*, are exceptions.

CHAPTER XV.

COLLECTIVES.

§ 348. THE so-called plurals which after the fashion of *oxen* and *feet*, are said to be formed from the singular by either adding *-en*, or changing the vowel, are *collec-*

tives, or, at any rate in a general way, collectives rather than true plurals. In the older stages of our language, they were more numerous than they are now.

(1.)

Hos-en	=	stocking-s	Scher-en	=	shire-s
Sho-en	=	shoe-s	Doghter-en	=	daughter-s
Ey-en	=	eye-s	Sustr-en	=	sister-s
Bischop-en	=	bishop-s	Uncl-en	=	uncle-s
Eldr-en	=	elder-s	Tre-en	=	tree-s
Arw-en	=	arrow-s	Souldr-en	=	soldier-s

(2.)

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>		<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	
Freónd	frýnd	<i>Friends.</i>	Burh	byrig	<i>Burghs.</i>
Feónd	fýnd	<i>Foes.</i>	Bróc	bréc	<i>Brechcs</i>
Niht	niht	<i>Night.</i>	Turf	tyrf	<i>Turves.</i>
Bóc	béc	<i>Books.</i>			

To these add, from the present language, *men, teeth, mice, lice, geese.*

Kine is doubly changed; the Scotch form being *kye*, from *cow*. The same is the case with *brethren*, the forms being *brethre* and *brothre* in the Old English.

§ 349. *Forms in -ery.*—These are doubly derivative; so that the analysis of *fishery, rookery, &c.*, is *fish-er-y, rook-e-ry, &c.* Though there is such a word as *fisher* = *fisherman*, there is no such word as *rooker*, from which we get *rookery*. Neither does *fishery* mean a collection of *fishermen*, but one of *fishes*. Besides *yeomanry* and *Jewry*, the words *Englishry, Danishry, and Welshery*, are to be found in old authors.

Thise justise er atteynt of falshed and folie,
Now comes a new pleynt to destroie þe *Juerie*,
þe king was enquere of þer wikked dedes
So many þer were dome on þam salle nedes.

ROBERT OF BOURNE 247.

In *Jewry* is God known, his name is great in Israel. Ps. 76.

Dardan hight þe cheftaȳn of þat company,
 Sadok sonne of Denmark kȳng *Dancery*.—ROB. BR. 16.

With lordes þat were nehi he held his parlement
 Al gole at Denebeghi, after þam alle he sent,
 To fend the *Walschrie* with him at þer powere.

ROB. BR. 244.

Eyrie is generally said to mean the nest of an eagle.

As an eagle, fed with morning,
 Scorns the embattled tempest's warning
 When she seeks her *eyrie*, hanging
 In the mountain cedar's hair,
 And her brood expect the clanging
 Of her wings through the wild air
 Sick with famine.—SHELLEY.

It rather means the *collection of eggs*, or *eggery*; for such is the old form of the word.

§ 350. What, however, is the *r*? In the old Dutch and other allied dialects, we find a kind of plural in *-r*.

Hus-ir,	<i>houses</i> ,	O.H.G.
Chalp-ir,	<i>calfs</i> ,	do.
Lemp-ir,	<i>lambs</i> ,	do.
Plet-ir,	<i>blades</i> ,	do.
Eigir,	<i>eggs</i> ,	do.

Indeed, in one word it occurs in provincial and archaic English, viz. *childer* = *children*. All these are of the neuter gender.

In other words, such as *foolery*, *prudery*, *bravery*, *slavery*, *witchery*, *stitchery* (*needlework*), &c., however, this origin is inadmissible, and the idea of collection or assemblage is either obscure or non-existent, the *-ry* having originated out of a false analogy.

<i>Frisian.</i>	<i>German.</i>	<i>Danish.</i>
Shríwwerài	Schreiberei	Skriverie.
Swênnerài	Schweineri	Schwinerie.
Thiewerài	Dieberei	Tyverie.

meaning *writing*, *swinishness*, and *theft*, respectively.

§ 351. *Retrospect.*—For the difference between current and obsolete processes see above. Having become familiar with this, look back upon the numerous forms, in the way of Derivation, which have just been given. Doing this, observe which are obsolete, which current. As a general rule, most of them are obsolete; especially the patronymics and diminutives. The abstract forms, however, are in full force; a fact by which we may measure the wants and condition of the English Language.

CHAPTER XVI.

ON DERIVED VERBS.

§ 352. THREE classes of *derived* verbs deserve notice.

1. Those ending in *-en*; an affix which may be attached to either an adjective or an abstract substantive; as *soft-en*, *whit-en*, &c., from *soft*, *white*, &c., and *strength-en*, *length-en*, from *strength* and *length*. They confer the quality which the adjective implies, and which the abstract substantive denotes by name.

2. Transitive verbs derived from intransitives by a change of the vowel of the root.

Rise	Raise.
Lie	Lay.
Sit	Set.
Fall	Fell.
Drink	Drench.

In Anglo-Saxon these words were more numerous than they are at present.

<i>Intrans.</i>		<i>Trans.</i>	
Yrnan	<i>run.</i>	ærnan	<i>make to run.</i>
Byrnan	<i>burn.</i>	bernān	<i>make to burn.</i>
Drincan	<i>drink.</i>	drencan	<i>drench.</i>
Sincan	<i>sink.</i>	sencan	<i>make to sink.</i>

<i>Intrans.</i>		<i>Trans.</i>	
Liegan	<i>lie.</i>	lecgan	<i>lay.</i>
Sittan	<i>sit.</i>	settan	<i>set.</i>
Drifan	<i>drift.</i>	dræfan	<i>drive.</i>
Fëallan	<i>fall.</i>	fyllan	<i>fell.</i>
Wëallan	<i>boil.</i>	wyllan	<i>make to boil</i>
Flëogan	<i>fly.</i>	a-fligan	<i>put to flight.</i>
Bëogan	<i>bow.</i>	bigan	<i>bend.</i>
Faran	<i>go.</i>	feran	<i>convey.</i>
Wacan	<i>wake.</i>	weccan	<i>awaken.</i>

3. Verbs formed from nouns by changing a final sonant into its corresponding surd; as—

<i>The breath</i>	.	.	<i>to breathe pronounced</i>	<i>breádh.</i>
<i>The cloth</i>	.	.	<i>to clothe</i>	— <i>clódh.</i>

Some of the words thus modified are of foreign origin, as *use* (*uze*) from *use* (pr. *uce*); *greaze* from *grease*, and *prize* from *price*.

CHAPTER XVII.

ADVERBS.

§ 353. THAT adverbs are formed by means of composition was shown when the nature of the termination *-ly* was explained. It will be shown in the sequel that they may also originate in Derivation, especially in Inflection.

That they are susceptible of the Degrees of Comparison has been seen.

§ 354. Certain forms in *-ing* now remain for notice In such an expression as—

The candle went out, and so we went darkling.—King Lear.

the last word is no participle of a verb *darkle*, but an

adverb of derivation, like *unwaringŭn* = *unawares*, Old High-German; *stillenge* = *secretly*, Middle High-German; *blindlings* = *blindly*, New High-German; *darnungo* = *secretly*; Old Saxon; *nichtinge* = *by night*, Middle Dutch; *blindelind* = *blindly*, New Dutch; *bæclinga* = *backwards*; *handlunga* = *hand to hand*, Anglo-Saxon; and, finally, *blindlins*, *backlins*, *darklins*, *middlins*, *scantlins*, *stridelins*, *stowlins*, in Lowland Scotch.

§ 355. *Certain Adverbs of Place.*—It is a common practice for languages to express by different modifications of the same root the idea—

(1.) Of rest *in a place*.

(2.) Of motion *towards* a place.

(3.) Of motion *from* a place.

It is also a common practice of language to depart from the original expression of each particular idea, and to interchange the signs by which they are expressed.

This may be seen in the following table, illustrative of the forms *here*, *hither*, *hence*.

<i>Mæso-Gothic</i>	par, þap, þapro, hēr, hiþ, hidrō,	<i>there, thither, thence.</i> <i>here, hither, hence.</i>
<i>Old High-German</i>	huār, huara, huanana, dār, dara, danana, her, hēra, hinana,	<i>where, whither, whence.</i> <i>there, thither, thence.</i> <i>here, hither, hence.</i>
<i>Old Saxon</i>	huar, huar, huanan, thar, thar, thanan, hēr, hēr, hēnan,	<i>where, whither, whence.</i> <i>there, thither, thence.</i> <i>here, hither, hence.</i>
<i>Anglo-Saxon</i>	þar, þider, þonan, hvar, hvider, hvonan, hēr, hider, hēnan,	<i>there, thither, thence.</i> <i>where, whither, whence.</i> <i>here, hither, hence.</i>
<i>Old Norse</i>	þar, þaðra, þaðan, hvar, hvert, hvadan, hēr, hœðra, hœðan,	<i>there, thither, thence.</i> <i>where, whither, whence.</i> <i>here, hither, hence.</i>
<i>Middle High-German</i>	dā, dan, dannen, wā, war, wannen, hie, hēr, hennen,	<i>there, thither, thence.</i> <i>where, whither, whence.</i> <i>here, hither, hence.</i>
<i>Modern High-German</i>	da, dar, dannen, wo, wohin, wannen, hie, her, hinnen.	<i>there, thither, thence.</i> <i>where, whither, whence.</i> <i>here, hither, hence.</i>

These local terminations were commoner in the earlier stages of language than at present. The following are from the Mæso-Gothic :—

Innaprô	= from within.
Útaprô	= from without.
Īupaprô	= from above.
Fáirrar ô	= from afar.
Allaprô	= from all quarters.

A reason for the comparative frequency of these forms in Mæso-Gothic lies in the fact of the Gospel of Ulphilas being a translation from the Greek. The Greek forms in -θεν, ἔσωθεν, ἔξωθεν, ἄνωθεν, πόρρωθεν, πάντοθεν, were just the forms to encourage such a formation as that in -pro.

§ 356. *Yonder*.—In the Mæso-Gothic we have the following forms: *jáinar*, *jáind*, *jáinprô* = *illic*, *illuc*, *illinc*. They do not, however, explain the form *yon-d-er*. It is not clear whether the *d* = the -*d* in *jáind*, or the *p* in *jáinprô*.

§ 357. *Anon*, as used by Shakespear and others in the sense of presently.—The probable history of this word is as follows:—the first syllable contains a root akin to the root *yon*, signifying *distance in place*. The second is a shortened form of the Old High-German and Middle High-German -*nt*, a termination expressive (1) of removal in space; (2) of removal in time: Old High-German, *enont* *enont*; Middle High-German, *enentlig*, *jenunt* = *beyond*. The transition from the idea of *place* to that of *time* is shown in the Old High-German, *nühunt*, and the Middle High-German, *vèrrent* = *lately*; the first from the root *nigh*, the latter from the root *far*. The Scotch *anent* is a word of this class.

§ 358. *Where*, *when*, &c.—A certain class of Adverbs were once cases. Thus,—

Where, *there*, and *here* were the Datives Feminine Singular of *who*, *that*, and *he*, meaning *in what direction*,

in that direction, in this direction, = quâ, and illâ, hâc regione.

When and then were Accusatives Masculine = *at what, at that, time*.

The, in such expressions as *all the more, all the better*, was an Instrumental = *eo plus, eo melius*. It arose out of *þy*, and was a different word from *the* the Definite Article, of which the A. S. form was *þe*, its *the* is to *this*, so is *why* = *quâ ratione*, to *who*. These may be called disguised cases.

CHAPTER XVIII.

INFLECTION.—DECLENSION.—OF NOUNS.—OF VERBS.

§ 359. INFLECTION now comes under notice. It is a peculiar kind of Derivation; of Derivation rather than Composition. It is, however, by no means, certain that a definition could be framed so as to exclude all Compounds without inconvenience. The word *further-s*, whether taken as a Possessive Case or as a Nominative Plural, is a good sample of Inflection. The addition to the main word is the sound expressed by the single letter *-s*. That this is not a whole word is evident. By going back, however, to the Anglo-Saxon period we find that it was preceded by a vowel—*e* or *a*, as the case might be. Now, though this gives us a syllable, the affix is as far from being a separate and independent word as ever: and, hence, it belongs to derivation rather than composition. But what if it be both possible, and probable, that *all* derivation was once composition, just as all composition was, originally, the juxtaposition of separate words? For most purposes, however, composition and derivation are

totally different; and, for most purposes, Inflection is a peculiar kind of *Derivation*. It (Inflection) falls into (1) Declension, and (2) Conjugation.

§ 360. Declension, when fully developed as it is in the Latin, Greek, and other languages, and as it is *not* developed in the English, gives (1) Gender, (2) Number, (3) and Case.

§ 361. Conjugation, in like manner, and when similarly developed, gives (1) Voice, (2) Mood, (3) Tense, (4) Person. These are called the *Accidents* of the Inflected Parts of Speech. The Inflected Parts of Speech being (1) the Noun, (2) the Verb.

§ 362. Nouns are (1) Pronouns, (2) Substantives, (3) Adjectives. Participles are, in some respects, Adjectives in other Verbs.

To give precedence to the Pronoun over the Substantive and Adjective is unusual. The step, however, will be justified as we proceed.

Adverbs, as may be seen by what has preceded, inasmuch as they can take the Degrees of Comparison, are susceptible of Derivation, not, however, of Inflection.

Particles are wholly incapable of Derivation. They may arise out of Inflection; but they are not themselves inflected. Prepositions, Conjunctions, and Interjections, are Particles. So are the words Yes and No; and in some languages, the words expressive of Interrogation.

The Copula *am, art, is, was, be, &c.*, has certain peculiarities which may give it a claim to be considered as a separate part of speech. It is generally, however, and not inconveniently, treated as a Verb; being called the Verb Substantive.

The Cardinal Numerals, also, have certain peculiarities.

The Article is, in origin, a Pronoun; but, as it has no existence except when connected with a Noun, it is, to a certain extent, an Inflection.

§ 363. Nouns are declined, verbs are both declined and conjugated.

§ 364. The declension of verbs is a fact which should never be overlooked ; otherwise we run the risk of drawing a broader line between them and the noun than the structure of language warrants. Without doubt the difference is both important and striking, and, without doubt, the two classes are natural. This, however, is wholly insufficient to put them in anything like *contrast* to one another. Though the noun has no moods and tenses, it cannot be said that the verb has no cases. More than this. If, on the strength of its decided verbal character, we connect the participle with the verb (and in some sense most grammarians do so connect it) the inflection of the verb gives us not only cases, but numbers and genders as well ; for, although, in the present stage of our language, the participles are uninflected, in Anglo-Saxon their inflection was full, as it was in the Greek and Latin, and as it is in many modern languages. But without having recourse to the participle, which is generally, though not consistently, treated as a separate part of speech, the infinitive mood, along with the gerunds and supines, where they exist, is, for most purposes, a substantive. In Old High-German we have *blasennes* = *flandi* and others. We may call this a Gerund if we choose. We may also, if we choose, call *to blasenne* a Supine ; nevertheless, the result is a Noun in a Case. This is because the name of an action is an Abstract Substantive. When we connect with the idea of time an agent we get something concrete. But this gives us Persons and Tenses. A horse may *run*, or a man. The horse may *run* to-day, the man may have *run* yesterday ; but if I wish to have the notion of the act of *running*, I must separate, or *draw it* off, from both the horses and the men who perform it. In both these cases the result

is something which I can imagine, but which I cannot perceive through any of my senses. I can see a *man* in a *state of happiness*, and I can see a *horse* in the *act of running*. *Happiness*, however, without some happy object, or *the act of running*, without some object that runs, I cannot perceive; though I can imagine it. Both, however, are Substantives; one being the name of a quality, the other that of an action.

§ 365. In English we have such lines as

To err is human, *to forgive* divine—

To be or not to be, that is the question—

in which a substantive in the nominative case is represented by a verb with a preposition before it. *To err* means *error*, and *to forgive* means *forgiveness*.

In Greek we find

τὸ φθονῆν = *invidia*

τοῦ φθονῆν = *invidiae*

ἐν τῷ φθονῆν = *in invidia*.

This is because the name of any action may be used without any mention of the agent. Thus, we may speak of the simple fact of *walking* or *moving*, independently of any specification of the *walker* or *mover*. When actions are spoken of thus indefinitely, the idea of either person or number has no place in the conception; from which it follows that the so-called infinitive mood must be at once impersonal, and without the distinction of singular, dual, and plural. Nevertheless, the ideas of time and relation in space *have* place in the conception. We can think of a person *being in the act of striking a blow*, of his *having been in the act of striking a blow*, or of his *being about to be in the act of striking a blow*. We can also think of a person *being in the act of doing a good action*, or of his *being from the act of doing a good action*.

CHAPTER XIX.

ON GENDER.

§ 366. How far have we Genders in English? This depends on our definitions.

The distinction of sex by wholly different words, such as *boy* and *girl*; *father* and *mother*; *horse* and *mare*, &c., is *not* gender. Neither are words like *man-servant*, *he-goat*, &c., contrasted with *maid-servant*, *she-goat*, &c.

§ 367. In the Latin words *genitrix* = *a mother*, and *genitor* = *a father*, the difference of sex is expressed by a difference of termination: the words being either derived from each other, or from some common source. This, however, in strict grammatical language, is an approach to gender rather than to gender itself. Let the words be declined :—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Nom.</i>	Genitor	Genitrix.
	<i>Gen.</i>	Genitor- <i>is</i>	Genitric- <i>is</i> .
	<i>Dat.</i>	Genitor- <i>i</i>	Genitric- <i>i</i> .
	<i>Acc.</i>	Genitor- <i>em</i>	Genitric- <i>em</i> .
	<i>Voc.</i>	Genitor	Genitrix.
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Nom.</i>	Genitor- <i>es</i>	Genitric- <i>es</i> .
	<i>Gen.</i>	Genitor- <i>um</i>	Genitric- <i>um</i> .
	<i>Dat.</i>	Genitor- <i>ibus</i>	Genitric- <i>ibus</i> .
	<i>Acc.</i>	Genitor- <i>es</i>	Genitric- <i>es</i> .
	<i>Voc.</i>	Genitor- <i>es</i>	Genitric- <i>es</i> .

The syllables in italics are the signs of the cases and numbers. Now these signs are the same in each word, the difference of sex not affecting them. Contrast, however, with the words *genitor* and *genitrix* the words *domina* *a mistress*, and *dominus* = *a master*.

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Nom.</i>	Domin- <i>a</i>	Domin- <i>us</i> .
	<i>Gen.</i>	Domin- <i>æ</i>	Domin- <i>i</i> .
	<i>Dat.</i>	Domin- <i>æ</i>	Domin- <i>o</i> .
	<i>Acc.</i>	Domin- <i>am</i>	Domin- <i>um</i> .
	<i>Voc.</i>	Domin- <i>a</i>	Domin- <i>e</i> .

<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Nom.</i>	Domin-æ	Domin-i.
	<i>Gen.</i>	Domin-arum	Domin-orum.
	<i>Dat.</i>	Domin-abus	Domin-is.
	<i>Acc.</i>	Domin-as	Domin-os.
	<i>Voc.</i>	Domin-æ	Domin-i.

Here the letters in italics, or the signs of the cases and numbers, are different. Now it is very evident that, if *genitrix* be a specimen of gender, *domina* is something more.

§ 368. As terms, to be useful, must be limited, it may be laid down, as a sort of definition, that *there is no gender where there is no affection of the declension*:

§ 369. Another element in the notion of gender, although I will not venture to call it an essential one, is the following:—In the words *domina* and *dominus*, *mistress* and *master*, there is a *natural* distinction of sex; the one being masculine, or male, the other feminine, or female. In the words *sword* and *lance* there is no *natural* distinction of sex. Notwithstanding this, the word *hasta*, in Latin, is as much a feminine gender as *domina*, whilst *gladius* = *a sword*, is, like *dominus*, a masculine noun. From this we see that, in languages wherein there are true genders, a fictitious or conventional sex is attributed even to inanimate objects; so that sex is a natural distinction, gender a grammatical one. Now, in English, we sometimes attribute sex to objects naturally destitute of it. *The sun in his glory, the moon in her wane*, are examples of this. A sailor calls his ship *she*. A husbandman, according to Mr. Cobbett, does the same with his *plough* and working implements:—

“In speaking of a *ship* we say *she* and *her*. And you know that our country-folk in Hampshire call almost everything *he* or *she*. It is curious to observe that country labourers give the feminine appellation to those things only which are more closely identified with themselves, and by the qualities or conditions of which their own efforts, and their character as workmen, are affected. The mower calls his *scythe* a *she*, the ploughman

calls his *plough* a *she*: but a prong, or a shovel, or a harrow, which passes promiscuously from hand to hand, and which is appropriated to no particular labourer, is called a *he*."—*English Grammar*, Letter V.

§ 370. Although this may account for a sailor calling his ship *she*, it will not account for the custom of giving to the sun a masculine, and to the moon a feminine, pronoun; still less will it account for the circumstance of the Germans reversing the gender, and making the *sun* feminine, and the *moon* masculine. The explanation here is different. Let there be a period in the history of a nation wherein the sun and moon are dealt with, not as inanimate masses of matter, but as animated divinities. Let there, in other words, be a period in the history of a nation wherein dead things are personified, and wherein there is a mythology. Let an object like the *sun* be deemed a male; and an object like the *moon* a female, deity, and we, easily, account for the Germans saying *the sun* in her *glory*; *the moon* in his *wane*.—"Mundilfori had two children; a son, *Máni* (Moon), and a daughter, *Sol* (Sun)."—Such is an extract taken out of an Icelandic mythological work, viz. the prose Edda. In the classical languages, however, *Phœbus* and *Sol* are masculine, and *Luna* and *Diana* feminine. Hence it is, that although, in Anglo-Saxon and Old Saxon, the *sun* is *feminine*, it is, in English, masculine.

§ 371. *Philosophy*, *charity*, &c., or the names of abstract qualities personified, take a conventional sex, and are feminine from their being feminine in Latin. In these, words, there is no change of form, so that the consideration of them is a point of rhetoric, rather than of etymology.

CHAPTER XX.

NUMBER.

§ 372. HAVING separated the idea of Collectiveness from that of Plurality, we may ask to what extent have we numbers in English? Like the Greek, Hebrew, and Latin, we have a Singular and a Plural. Like the Latin, and unlike the Greek and Hebrew, we have no Dual. There is no dual in the *present* English. In the Anglo-Saxon there *was* an approach to one dual: *wit* = *we two*; *git* = *ye two*. Why this only an approach? Because *git* is, really, two words, *ye two* in a contracted form. There is no dual in the present German. In the ancient German there *was* one. In the present Danish and Swedish there is no dual. In the Old Norse and in the present Icelandic a dual number is to be found. From this we learn that the dual number is one of those inflections that languages drop as they become modern. The numbers, then, in the present English are two, the singular and the plural.

§ 373. Over what extent of language have we a plural? The Latins say, *bonus pater* = *a good father*; *boni patres* = *good fathers*. In the Latin, the adjective *bonus* changes its form with the change of number of the substantive that it accompanies. In English it is only the substantive that is changed. Hence we see that in the Latin language the numbers were extended to adjectives; whereas in English they are confined to the substantives and pronouns. Compared with the Anglo-Saxon, the present English is in the same relation as it is to the Latin. In the Anglo-Saxon there were plural forms for the adjectives.

CHAPTER XXI.

CASE.

§ 374. THE extent to which there are, in the English language, cases, depends on the meaning which we attach to the word. In *a house of a father*, the relation between the words *father* and *house* is expressed by the preposition *of*. In *a father's house* the idea is, there or thereabouts, the same; the relation or connection between the two words being the same. The *expresssion*, however, differs. In *a father's house* the relation, or connection, is conveyed, not by a preposition, but by a change of form, *father* becoming *father's*.

The father taught the child.—Here there is neither preposition nor change of form; and the connection between the words *father* and *child* is denoted by the arrangement only.

§ 375. Now if the relation alone between two words constitute a case, the words or sentences, *child*; *to a father*; *of a father*; and *father's*, are all equally cases; of which one may be called the accusative, another the dative, a third the genitive, and so on. Perhaps, however, the relationship alone does *not* constitute a case.

§ 376. For etymological purposes it is necessary to limit the meaning of the word; and, as a sort of definition, it may be laid down that *where there is no change of form there is no case*. With this remark, the English language may be compared with the Latin.

	Latin.			English.
Sing.	Nom.	Pater	.	a father.
	Gen.	Patris	.	a father's.
	Dat.	Patri	.	to a father.
	Acc.	Patrem	.	a father.
	Abl.	Patre	.	from a father.

Here, since in the Latin language there are five changes of form, whilst in the English there are but *two*, there are (as far, at least, as the word *pater* and *father* are concerned) three more cases in Latin than in English.

§ 377. It does not, however, follow that because in *father* we have but two cases, there may not be other words wherein there are more than two. Neither does it follow that, because two words have the same form, they are in the same case, a remark which leads to the distinction between *a real and an accidental identity of form*. In the language of the Anglo-Saxons the genitive cases of the words *smith*, *end*, and *day* were respectively, *smithes*, *endes*, and *dayes*; whilst the nominative plurals were, respectively, *smithas*, *endas*, and *dayas*. A process of change took place by which the vowel of the last syllable in each word was ejected. The result was, that the forms of the genitive singular and the nominative plural, originally different, became one and the same; so that the identity of the two cases is an accident. This relieves the English grammarian from a difficulty. The nominative plural and the genitive singular are, in the present language of England, identical; the apostrophe in *father's* being a mere matter of orthography. However, there was *once* a difference. This modifies the previous statement, which may now stand thus:—*for a change of case there must be a change of form existing or presumed*.

§ 378. *The number of our cases and the extent of language over which they spread*.—In the English language there is undoubtedly a *nominative* case. This occurs in substantives, adjectives, and pronouns (*father*, *good*, *he*) equally. It is found in both numbers.

The words *him* and *them* (whatever they may have been originally) are now true accusatives. So are *thee*, *me*, *us*, and *you*. They are accusative thus far: 1. They are not

derived from any other case. 2. They are distinguished from the forms, *I, my, &c.* 3. Their meaning is accusative. Nevertheless, they are only imperfect accusatives. They have no sign of case, and are distinguished by negative characters only.

§ 379. One word of English is probably a true accusative in the strict sense of the term, viz. the word *twain* = *two*. The *-n* in *twai-n* is the *-n* in *hine* = *him* and *hwone* = *whom*, for which see § 401.

§ 380. *The determination of cases.*—How do we determine cases? In other words, why do we call *him* and them accusatives rather than datives or genitives? By one of two means; viz. either by the sense or the form. Suppose that in the English language there were ten thousand dative cases and as many accusatives. Suppose, also, that all the dative cases ended in *-m*, and all the accusatives in some other letter. It is very evident that, whatever might be the *meaning* of the words *him* and *them*, their *form* would be dative. In this case, the meaning being accusative, and the form dative, we should doubt which test to take.

§ 381. My own opinion is, that it would be convenient to determine cases by the *form* of the word *alone*; so that, even if a word had a dative sense only once, where it had an accusative sense ten thousand times, such a word should be said to be in the dative case. Now, as stated above, the words *him* and *them* (to which we may add *whom*) were once dative cases; *-m* in Anglo-Saxon being the sign of the dative case. In the time of the Anglo-Saxons their sense coincided with their form. At present they are dative forms with an accusative meaning. Still, as the word *give* takes after it a dative case, we have, even now, in the sentence, *give it him, give it them*, remnants of the old dative sense. To say, *give it to him, to them*, is unnecessary and pedantic: neither need we object

to the expression, *whom shall I give it*. If ever the formal test become generally recognized and consistently adhered to, *him*, *them*, and *whom* will be called datives with a latitude of meaning; and then the approximate accusatives in the English language will be the forms *you*, *thee*, *us*, *me*, and the only true accusative will be the word *twain*.

§ 382. For practical purposes, however, the present English avoids some of the difficulties here suggested. For the ordinary purposes of grammar, we use neither the term Accusative, nor the term Dative: making the term Objective serve for both. Doing this we say that the *him* is Objective, whatever may be the construction; *i. e.* whether it be Dative, as *like him*, *give it him*; Accusative, as *strike him*; or Ablative, as *part of him*, *take it from him*. For Virtual Cases, see § 419; for the English Instrumental, see § 403.

§ 383. *Current and obsolete Processes*.—The present is a proper time for exhibiting the difference between the current and the obsolete processes of a language. By adding the sound of the *s* in *seal* to the word *father*, we change it into *father-s*. Hence the addition of the sound in question is the process by which the word *father* is changed into *fathers*. The process by which *ox* is changed into *ox-en* is the addition of the sound of the syllable *-en*.

In all languages there are two sorts of processes, those that are in operation at a certain period, and those that have ceased to operate. In illustration of this, let us suppose that, from the Latin, Greek, French, or some other language, a new word was introduced into the English; and that this word was a substantive of the singular number. Suppose the word was *tak*, and that it meant a sort of *dwelling-house*. In the course of time it would be necessary to use this word as the plural; and the

question would arise as to the manner in which that number should be formed.

Now we have not less than three forms expressive of the idea of plurality, or something closely akin to it; and consequently three processes by which a singular may be converted into either a true plural or its equivalent:—

1. The addition of *-s*, *-z*, or *-ez* (*es*).
2. The change of vowel.
3. The addition of *-n*.

Notwithstanding this, it is very certain that the plural of a new word would *not* be formed in *-en* (like *oxen*) nor yet by a change of vowel (like *feet*); but by addition of *-s*—the one process being *current*, the other *obsolete*. Such the illustration; which, for the ordinary purposes of grammar, is sufficient. For the ordinary purposes of grammar, it may safely be said that the time has gone by for the development afresh of forms like *oxen* and *feet*. They are obsolete. In strict language, however, they are not obsolete plurals. They are, rather, collectives, which simulate plurals. (See § 348.) Still, they are obsolete.

CHAPTER XXII.

INFLECTION OF PRONOUNS.—ITS PECULIARITIES.—*SELF*, *ONE*, *OTHER*.—OF THE INTERROGATIVE, RELATIVE, AND DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS.—THE TRUE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

§ 384. IN respect to their Declension, Pronouns fall into three classes. In the first, it is purely Pronominal; in the second it is that of a Substantive; in the third it is that of an Adjective; *i. e.* it is nothing at all. Now

although this last is a negative fact, it is well to note it in a positive and decided manner; inasmuch as the differences in the declension of pronouns coincide with certain differences of power. Whilst words like *same* and *any* are both in import and in the want of declension closely akin to the Adjective; whilst *self*, with its plural *selves*, is Substantival; the typical Pronouns like *who* or *I*, &c., are neither one nor the other, either in sense or inflection; but members of a class, *per se*. In the present stage of our language these statements may be taken without either reserve or qualification; though, in the older stages, some reservations will be needed.

§ 385. The Adjectival Pronouns with the *no*-declension may be disposed of at once. They are *same*, *any*, *many*, and others. Their place is the dictionary rather than the grammar. Though, now undeclined, they were declined in A. S.

§ 386. The Substantival Pronouns are three in number:—

(1.)

Sing.

Nom. Self

Poss. Self's

Declined like *shelf*.

Plur.

Nom. Selves.

Poss. Selves'.

(2.)

Sing.

Nom. Other

Poss. Other's

Declined like *mother*.

Plur.

Nom. Others.

Poss. Others'.

(3.)

Sing.

Nom. One

Poss. One's

Declined like *swan*.

Plur.

Nom. Ones.

Poss. Ones'.

In A. S. these were declined like Adjectives.

§ 387. The identity of form between the words *one* the indefinite pronoun, and *one* the numeral, is entirely acci-

dental. The numeral has no plural number ; besides which, the meaning and the origin of the two words are different. The word under notice is derived from the French, and is the *on* in such expressions as *on dit*. This, in its turn, is from the Latin *homo* = *man*. The German for *on dit*, at the present time, is *man sagt* (*man says*) ; and until the Norman Conquest the same mode of expression prevailed in England. *One* is often called the Indeterminate Pronoun. It is used in the Possessive Case, and in the Plural Number in such expressions as—*One is unwilling to put one's friend to trouble.—My wife and little ones are well.—These are my two little ones' playthings*. Such forms as *self's* and *selves'* are undoubtedly rare. At the same time they are possible forms, and, if wanted, are strictly grammatical. Substitute the word *individuality* for *self*, and we see how truly its nature is *substantival* ; e.g. A. *This is the opinion of a humble individual (myself)*. B. *So much, then, for your humble individuality (self), and for your humble individuality's (self's) opinion*.

§ 388. The purely pronominal forms now come before us. They fall into two classes. Of the first, *who*, of the second, *thou* is the type.

§ 389. The small, but important, class to which *who*, with its congeners, belongs, gives two numbers, more than two cases, and, in its fuller form, three genders—three *true* genders.

It gives two numbers ; a singular and a plural, as *this*, *these*. This, however, though more than we find in the Adjective, is *not* more than we find in the Substantive.

It gives, at least, three cases : a Nominative *who*, a Possessive *whose*, and an Objective *whom*. The Objective case in the *Substantive* exists in the Syntax only : in other words it has no distinctive form. With the *Pronoun* we say *he struck him*. With the *Substantive* we say the

father loves the child, or, the child loves his father indifferently.

Finally, it gives, at least, two true genders and fragments of a third. One of these genders is a Neuter.

§ 390. This neuter ends in *-t*, and in the three words wherein it occurs we have the pronominal inflection in its typical form.

§ 391. The first division contains—

1. The Interrogative ;

2. The Relative ;

3. The Demonstrative Pronouns ;

all declined on the same principle : *i. e.* with the Neuter in *-t*, a Possessive in *-s*, and an Objective in *-m* ; as *wha-t*, *who-se*, *who-m*. This we have in the language as it now stands. In the Anglo-Saxon, however, there was a true Accusative Masculine in *-n*, *e. g.* *hwæne*. It is because the Interrogative, Relative, and Demonstrative Pronouns are declined on the same principle, that they form a natural group ; and it is because they best exemplify the pronominal inflection, that they come first.

§ 392. The Interrogative comes before the Relative because it is, apparently, the older part of speech. In our own, and many other languages, these two Pronouns are identical. In the Irish Gaelic, however, they are different ; and in more than one other tongue there is no Relative at all. The Interrogative, however, is universal. At any rate, though there are several languages which have an Interrogative without a Relative, I know of none where there is a Relative without an Interrogative.

§ 393. The A. S. form of the Interrogative was *hwā* : declined thus—Nom. : *hwa* ; Accus. : *hwæne* ; Dat. : *hwæm* ; Gen. : *hwæs* ; Genitive and Dative Feminine : *hwære* ; Genitive Plural : *hwæra* ; Instrumental : *hwi*. Closely connected with *hwi* (= *quā* causâ) is *how* (=

quo modo). The present forms of *hwæne*, *hwære*, and *hwi* have been already noticed. *Hwæra* (gen. plur.) is obsolete. As to *whose*, it only *seems* to end in *-se*. The proper spelling is *whoes* (*who's*). The vulgar error that *which* is the neuter of *who*, has already been corrected and condemned. The Inflection of the Relative is that of the Interrogative. It is only in respect to their syntax that they differ.

§ 394. *The Demonstratives*.—The Demonstratives imply the idea of something *pointed-out*. We can imagine a stage in the very infancy of language when the use of them was accompanied by the finger, and an object within reach was touched; one more distant pointed to; and one more distant still indicated by attention drawn to the direction in which it lay. In this condition of things there is one word for the far distant bodies, and, perhaps, two for those that lay within ken—these latter falling into two divisions: (1) one containing the *contiguous*, (2) one containing those that lay on the boundary line between the near and distant. Later still, one of these nearer objects might pass simply for something that was neither the speaker nor the person spoken to—in which case it would be little more than what is called the name for the third person. With this, as a preliminary, we may consider details.

§ 395. The Demonstrative for objects in the far distance is *yon*. It is only its history which brings the word in its present class. Looking to its declension only, it belongs to the adjectival pronouns. *Historically*, however, it is a word of importance. It is an old one. It is German, being the *jen-* in *jen-er*. It is the Lithuanic *anás*, *that*, *yon*; and, in both the German and the Lithuanic, it is declined in full. The declension, however, in English is obsolete.

§ 396. The name for objects near enough to be consi-

dered at-hand, and, at the same time, far enough to be separated from anything within touch (there or thereabouts), yet not in the vague distance, is \surd *th*, or the root *th*-, as in *this* and *that*. I can devise no better exposition than this. The word in question is not *this*, is not *that*, is not *the*. It is something which, without being either one or the other exactly, gives us all three. It shows itself very definitely as *this* and *that*—contrasted with one another, and indicating *comparative* and *definite* nearness; nearness which is *comparative* when contrasted with what is expressed by *yon*; and *definite*, when contrasted with the meaning of *the* and *they*.

§ 397. This division into the definite and indefinite gives us what has just been foreshadowed, namely, something sufficiently demonstrative to be neither *this* nor *that* (still less *yon*), and something sufficiently connected with the speaker to mean something related to him, without being either himself or the person spoken to. In other words, it gives us a *third* object, and when that object is a human being, a *third person*. All this has been given as a preliminary, because *he*, *she*, and *it*, generally dealt with as Personal Pronouns of the Third Person, are here treated as Demonstratives; in which case *he* and *she* = *that person*, and *it* = *that thing*. How far this alteration is gratuitous or scientific will be seen as we proceed.

§ 398. *Upon the whole*, the Demonstratives are declined like the Interrogatives. No wonder. They answer to them.

Question. What is that?

Answer. It is *this*, *that*, *he*, *she*, or *it*, as the case may be.

Upon the whole, the two sections belong to the same class; though there are details in which they differ. All, however, have a neuter in *-t*; as *wha-t*, *tha-t*, *i-t*.

§ 399. The present declension of the demonstrative pronouns is as follows :—

		(1.) <i>He.</i>	
	<i>Masc.</i>	<i>Neut.</i>	<i>Fem.</i>
<i>Nom.</i>	He	It	—
<i>Obj.</i>	Him	It	Her.
<i>Poss.</i>	His	—	Her.
<i>Secondary, or *Predicatively Adjectival, Poss.</i>	—	Its	Hers.
No plural form.			

(2.)

She—Defective in the oblique cases.

(3.)

		<i>That.</i>	
<i>Sing. Nom.</i>	That	<i>Plur. Nom.</i>	<i>They</i>
<i>Obj.</i>	That	<i>Obj.</i>	<i>Them</i>
—		<i>Poss.</i>	<i>Their</i>
—	<i>Secondary, or *Predicatively Adjectival, Poss.</i>	} <i>Theirs</i>	

His.—*Mutatis mutandis*, what applies to *whose* applies to *his*.

Et quidem ipsa vox *his*, ut et interrogativum *whose*, nihil aliud sunt quam *her's*, *who's*, ubi *s* omnino idem præstat quod in aliis possessivis. Similiter autem *his* pro *hec's* eodem errore quo nonnunquam *bin* pro *been*; item *whose* pro *who's* eodem errore quo *done*, *gone*, *knowne*, *growne*, &c., pro *doen*, *goen*, *known*, vel *do'n*, *go'n*, *know'n*, *grow'n*; utrobique contra analogiam lingue; sed usu defenditur.—WALLIS, c. v.

§ 400. *The A. S. hira*.—*Hira* (with an *-a*) was the A. S. Genitive Plural. Like *hwæra*, however, *hira* = *eorum* and *earum* has been superseded. Considering that the whole A. S. plural of *he* is obsolete, we may well say that the phenomenon of defect and complement is greatly developed amongst the English Pronouns.

§ 401. *It*.—That this, notwithstanding the loss of the initial breathing, is a true inflexion of *he* we learn from the A. S., where the genders run Masc. *he*, Fem. *heo*, Neut. *hit*. In the present German the *h* is lost altogether; and *er* = *he*, *es* = *it*.

* For the meaning of this, see the Syntax.

Its.—This is not only a characteristic form, but a recent one. It is in English such a form as *idius*, or *illudius*, instead of *ejus* or *illius* would be in Latin; giving us an inflection engrafted upon an inflection, *i. e.* an *-s* as the sign of the Possessive Case attached to a *-t* as the sign of the Neuter Gender.

Hoo.—The A. S. *heo* = *she*.—Though replaced in the present language by *she*, the A. S. *heo* is still to be found as a provincialism—generally as *hoo*; sometimes (wrongly) as *her* or *hur*.

Him.—Now objective, *i. e.* either dative or accusative. Originally, dative only.

The A. S. *hyne*.—In A. S. the accusative was *hyne*, now obsolete, though not extinct. It is the *en* (= *him*) of the Dorsetshire dialect.

§ 402. *She*.—At present this word is uninflected. In A. S., however, it was a truly feminine form, from *se*. It had not, however, its present power; but rather coincided with the definite article, which ran—

Se = δ

Seo = η

Thæt = $\tau\omicron$

in Greek.

Se is extinct; displaced by *the*. What was its development? In the German languages slight. The Mæso-Gothic gives *sa* and *so*; the Old Norse *sá* and *sú*. Where are the equivalents to *him*, *her*, &c.? Why should they not be looked for? They will be found if sought—though not within the pale of Germany. The Lithuanic is the language that best illustrates this now fragmentary form; the Lithuanic giving us a full declension of the root *-sz-*. It means *this*—so that *szís*, *szí* = *se seo*, whilst *jís*, *jí* = *he* and *heo*—the declension of the two words being the same; as, doubtless, they were originally in German.

	<i>Singular.</i>	
	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
<i>Nominative.</i>	sziš	szi
<i>Accusative.</i>	szi	szié
<i>Locative.</i>	sziámè	sziójè
<i>Dative.</i>	sziáin	sziel
<i>Instrumental.</i>	sziüm	sziè
<i>Genitive.</i>	szió	sziós
	<i>Dual.</i>	
<i>Nominative.</i>	sziüdu*	sziédoi
<i>Accusative.</i>	sziüdu	sziédoi
<i>Dative.</i>	sziéndvém	sziómdoëm
<i>Instrumental.</i>	sziéndvém	sziómdvein
<i>Genitive.</i>	sziüdvéjü	sziüdvéjü
	<i>Plural.</i>	
<i>Nominative.</i>	sziš	sziós
<i>Accusative.</i>	sziüs	sziès
<i>Locative.</i>	sziüšè	sziösè
<i>Dative.</i>	sziëms	szióms
<i>Instrumental.</i>	sziëis	sziómis
<i>Genitive.</i>	sziü	sziü

So comes from \sqrt{s} -, as *how* comes from \sqrt{hw} -, though the exact details are uncertain.

Such, too, is to \sqrt{s} -, *mutatis mutandis*, as *which* is to \sqrt{wh} -, the full form being *swa-lik*. It is also the Lithuanic *soks*.

§ 403. *The, they, that, this*.—The inflection of $\sqrt{-th}$ was essentially that of \sqrt{hw} -, and \sqrt{he} . It ran in A. S. *þæt, þone, þam, þære, þæs* : Nom. and Acc. Plural *þá*. Gen. *þara*—Instrumental *þy*. In expressions like *all the more* = *eo majus* the *the* is the A. S. *þy*, not the article *þe* = *he*.

§ 404. With these preliminaries, it is not difficult to give the historic details of the defect and complement with *th*-, as they appear in *they, their*, and *them*, which are, at the present time, only found in the plural.

A form *þe* = *the*, common for all cases, all numbers, and all genders, displaced *se*.

* Meaning \sqrt{sh} + *two*.

Its displaced *his*.

Him as an objective case singular, displaced *hyne*.

Nothing, then, was left but the plural forms, which now remain, and, these—viz. *they*, *their*, *them* displaced the A. S. *he*, *heora*, *heom*.

§ 405. The details between *these* and *those* are obscure. At the present time *those* is the plural of *th*; of which the neuter is *that*. In like manner *these* is the plural of *this*; a word which is declined on the same principle as the preceding. Hence it had *pisne* (provincial *thisn*) as an accusative, *pisum* as a dative, *pises* as a genitive, *pissa* as a genitive plural. In some of the allied dialects we find the feminine and genitive plural forms in *-re*, and *-ra*, as *pisre*, *pisra*. Now it is clear that in *these* the *-s* is no inflection, but a radical part of the word, like the *s* in *geese*. But what of the final *e*? Was it mute? If so, it is a mere point of spelling. Dr. Guest, however, has made this view untenable, and shown that, in the Old English at least, it was an actual sign of number.

When *thise* Bretons tuo were fled out of *this* land.—ROBERT OF BOURNE.

This is thilk disciple that bereth witnessyng of *these* thingis, and wroot them.—WICLIFFE, John xxi.

Say to us in what powers thou doist *these* thingis, and who is he that gaf to thee *this* power.—WICLIFFE, Luke xx.

§ 406. And now the neuter termination *-t* commands attention. Although, in the English language, it is found in three pronouns only, the form is an important one. In the Mæso-Gothic it pervades the whole inflection of adjectives; so that their neuters end in *-ta*, just as truly as the Latin neuters end in *-um*, or the Greek in *-ov*.

	<i>Masc.</i>	<i>Fem.</i>	<i>Neut.</i>
	Blind- <i>a</i> ,	blind- <i>a</i> ,	blind- <i>ata</i> ;
like			
	<i>Masc.</i>	<i>Fem.</i>	<i>Neut.</i>
	Cæc- <i>us</i> ,	cæc- <i>a</i> ,	cæc- <i>um</i> .

In Norse, too, at the present moment, all neuters end in *-t*, *skön* = *pulch-er*, *skönt* = *pulchr-um*. In the modern High-German this *-t* becomes *-s*, M. *blind-er*, N. *blind-es*. But it is the Latin *-d*, in *i-d*, *illu-d*, *istu-d*—and, as such, a very old inflection. And now comes a fact which (whilst it justifies the importance and prominence given to the pronominal inflection, of which, in practice, this neuter in *-t* has been the characteristic), shows us how, in languages of the same order, a mere alteration in the distribution of certain inflections may effect a great change. There are two types of inflection in the way of Gender—one given by the Substantives, the other by the Pronouns. The Adjectives have none of their own. They take that of the Substantive, or the Pronoun, according to the language. The Latin adjectives (along with the Greek) follow the substantives, the result being *cæc-us*, *cæc-um*, like *dominus*, *regn-um*. The German follow the pronouns; the result being *blind-s*, *blind-ata*, like *who*, *what*.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE TRUE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

§ 407. THE true Personal Pronouns, *as far as inflection is concerned*, are in *English*, $\surd m-$, $\surd th-$ and $\surd y-$. It is not safe to go more minutely into detail than this; though, roughly speaking, we may say that they are *me* (1st person); *thou* (2nd person singular); and *ye* (2nd person plural). They run thus:—

		(1.)	
<i>Sing.</i>	Objective	<i>me.</i>
	Possessive	. . .	<i>my.</i>
<i>Plural.</i>	Nominative	. . .	<i>we.</i>
	Objective	. . .	<i>us.</i>
	Possessive	. . .	<i>our.</i>

(2.)

<i>Singular (only).</i>	Nominative	.	.	.	<i>thou.</i>
	Objective	'	.	.	<i>thee.</i>
	Possessive	.	.	.	<i>thy.</i>

(3.)

<i>Plural (only).</i>	Nominative or Objective	.	.	.	<i>ye.</i>
	Objective or Nominative	.	.	.	<i>you.</i>
	Possessive	.	.	.	<i>your.</i>

§ 408. The exact details of the difference between *me* and *my* are obscure. The A. S. gives *meh* and *mec*; both Dative and Accusative rather than Possessive. The allied language gives

	<i>Dative.</i>	<i>Accusative.</i>
Maeso-Gothic	<i>mis</i>	<i>mik</i>
„ „	<i>pus</i>	<i>puk</i>
„ „	<i>sis</i>	<i>sik</i>
Old High-German	<i>mer</i>	<i>mih</i>
„ „	<i>dir</i>	<i>dih</i>
„ „	„	<i>sih</i>
Old Norse	<i>mēr</i>	<i>mik</i>
„ „	<i>pēr</i>	<i>pik</i>
„ „	<i>sēr</i>	<i>sik</i>
Middle H. G.	<i>mir</i>	<i>mich</i>
„ „	<i>dir</i>	<i>dich</i>
„ „	„	<i>sich</i>

As far as the form in *-k* (= *h*) goes, this looks like Composition rather than Declension, the *-k* being the *-c* in *hi-c*, *hæ-c*, *ho-c*.

§ 409. That *we*, *our*, and *us* are etymologically allied, i. e. that they are forms of the same word rather than different words, is shown by the A. S. *user* = *our*, and by the Norse *vi* and *vor* = *we* and *our*. The evidence that they are connected with *me* is not so clear. The affinity, however, between the sounds of *m* and *w*, along with other phenomena, account for it.

For the double, or equivocal power of *ye* and *you*, as well as for the possibly Nominative power of *me*, and for *mine* and *thine*, see § § 519, 520.

§ 410. *Our-s*, *your-s* (also *their-s*), are cases of *our*, *your* (and *their*), i. e. each is a case upon a case. We may call them cases of *me*, *you* (and *their*) if we choose. They are, however, no samples of any Pronominal inflection, but, rather, *catachrestic* substantival forms.

§ 411. A retrospect will show that the separation of *her* *she*, and *it*, from *me*, *thou*, and *ye* was necessary. To class the names for the persons or things spoken about with the names of the speaker and the person spoken to is, if taken by itself, legitimate. But it is traversed by the differences of form. The importance of the neuter in *-t* has been indicated. But this is not all. To place *they*, *their*, and *them* among the true personals is to separate them from *this* and *that*.

• NOTE.

ON THE WORD *I*.

In the declension of *me* no notice was taken of *I*. Nevertheless, in all the previous editions of the present work, as well as elsewhere, I have given it a place among the true personal pronouns. And, doubtless, its place is with *me* and *thee*. If *I* be not a personal pronoun,—a personal pronoun of the first person singular—what is it?

The foregoing chapter, however, treated not of personal pronouns in general, but of their declension, and *I* is undeclined. Is this a sufficient reason for excluding it,—for, apparently, ignoring its very existence? In the present stage of our language *she* is undeclined: yet *she* has been treated somewhat fully. To treat *I* as the nominative case of *me* would, of course, have been absurd; but why not have said (as up to the present time has been said) that *I* was defective in the oblique cases, *me* in the nominative; and that they were complementary to one another? *Mutatis mutandis*, this is what was said of *he* and *she*; the former being defective in the nominative feminine, the latter defective in everything else. A partial answer to this is conveyed in the statement that *she* had once a declension; but that *I* never had one. But this is an under-statement. *I* is, to all appearances, something more than a mere undeclined word in the present stage of the English language. It is something more than a word that has never been declined. It is a word essentially undeclinable. As a pronoun of the first person, it is the name of the speaker, whoever he (or *she*) may be—the name of a speaker speaking of himself. But such a speaker may be one of two things. He may be the object of some action from without;

or he may be the originator of some action interior to, and proceeding from, himself. In other words, there may be a division of the Pronouns of the first person into two classes—(1) the Subjective; and (2) the Objective; the former being essentially Nominative. Now, in all the languages more especially akin to our own, and known by the name Indo-European, this difference exists: *i. e.* *I* is never a form of *me*. On the other hand, in the languages allied to the Fin, or Ugrian, it is always one.

Nominative	<i>mina.</i>
Infinitive	<i>minua.</i>
Genitive	<i>minun.</i>
Inessive	<i>minussa.</i>
Elative	<i>minuhur.</i>
Illative	<i>minuun.</i>
Nominative	<i>ben.</i>
Genitive.	<i>benum.</i>
Dative	<i>band.</i>
Accusative	<i>beni.</i>
Ablative	<i>benden.</i>

The first of these examples is from the Fin of Finland, the second from the Turkish.

CHAPTER XXIV.

INFLECTION OF SUBSTANTIVES.—THE PLURAL NUMBERS AND POSSESSIVE CASE IN S.—DETAILS.

§ 412. THE A. S. Possessive *Singular* ended in *-es*; as *cýning*, *cýning-es* = *rex*, *reg-is*. The A. S. Nominative *Plural* ended in *-as*, as *cýning-as* = *reg-es*. The present English ejects the vowel, whether *e* or *a*; so reducing the two cases to the same form. It distinguishes them, however, in the *spelling*; inasmuch as we write *kings* = *reg-es*, but *king's* = *regis*.

§ 413. The Possessive *Plural*, in A. S., ended in *-a*; as *cýning-a* = *regum*. The present English knows nothing of this form. It rarely forms a *real* Possessive Plural at all. When it does, it does so by adding the *-s*

of the Singular to the Nominative Plural; as *ox-en ox-ens*. But this is only done with those few words where the Nominative Plural does *not* already end in *-s*; *men, men's; brethren, brethren's; children, children's*. This avoids such expressions as *the fatherses children, the sisterses brethren, the masterses men*. The difference, however, we indicate in *writing*.

<i>The father's children</i> means the children of one father;	<i>The master's men, the men of one master;</i>
<i>The sister's brethren, the brethren of one sister;</i>	<i>The owner's oxen, the oxen of one owner.</i>

But—

<i>The fathers' children</i> means the children of different fathers;	<i>The masters' men, the men of different masters;</i>
<i>The sisters' brethren, the brethren of different sisters;</i>	<i>The owners' oxen, the oxen of different owners.</i>

With these preliminaries, and with a knowledge of the five fundamental rules of Euphony,* we shall find that

* These are—

(1.) Two mutes, one of which is surd and the other sonant, coming together in the same syllable, cannot be pronounced.

(2.) A surd mute, immediately preceded by a sonant one, is changed into its sonant equivalent.

(3.) A sonant mute, immediately preceded by a surd one, is changed into its sonant equivalent.

(4.) In certain cases, a vowel or a liquid has the same effect upon the surd letter *s*, as a sonant mute.

Hills is pronounced *hillz*.

Stems — *stenz*.

Horns — *hornz*.

Stars — *starz*.

Boys — *boyz*.

(5.) When two identical or cognate sounds come together in the same syllable, they must be separated from each other by the insertion of the sound of the *e* in *bed—loss, loss-es; blaze, blaz-es*. Here we must remember, not only that *z, zh, and sh* comport themselves as *-s*, but that the *-ch* in *church, &c.*, and *-ge* in *judge, &c.*, are really *tsh* and *dzh*, whence *church-es, judg-es, &c.* In *monarch, &c.*, the *ch* is not *tsh* but *k* (*x*); the plural being *monarchs*.

the formation of our Plurals is very regular; the apparent anomalies being chief points of spelling, like *cargoes*, *beauties*, &c., from *cargo* and *beauty*.

§ 414. A few, however, are something more. Thus—
The plural of—

wife	is not	wifes *	but	wives †
loaf	—	loafs	—	loaves
knife	—	knifes	—	knives
half	—	halfs	—	halves
life	—	lifes	—	lives
leaf	—	leafs	—	leaves
calf	—	calfs	—	calves.

Respecting these words we may observe—(1.) That the vowel before *f* is *long*; (2.) that they are all of Anglo-Saxon origin. Putting these two facts together, we can use more general language, and say that—When a word ends in the sound of *f*, preceded by a long vowel, and is of Anglo-Saxon origin, the plural is formed by the addition of the sound of the *z* in *zeal*.

§ 415. To this rule there are two exceptions:

1. *Dwarf*; a word of Anglo-Saxon origin, but which forms its plural by means of the sound of *s*—*dwarfs* (pronounced *dwarfce*):

2. *Beef*; a word *not* of Anglo-Saxon origin, but which forms its plural by means of the sound of *z*—*beeves* (pronounced *beevz*).

§ 416. If we ask the reason of this peculiarity in the formation of the plurals of these words in *-f*, we shall find reason to believe that it lies with the singular rather than with plural forms. In Anglo-Saxon, *f* at the end of a word was, probably, sounded as *v*; and it is likely that the original *singulars* were sounded *loav*, *halv*, *wive*, *calv*, *leav*. In the Swedish language the letter *f* has the sound of *v*; so that *staf* is sounded *stav*. Again, in the

* As if written *wifce*, &c. † As if written *wivz*, &c.

allied languages the words in question end in the *sonant* (not the *surd*) mute,—*weib, laub, calb, halb, stab, &c.* = *wife, leaf, calf, half, staff*. Hence the *plural* is probably normal; it being the *singular* form on which the irregularity lies.

§ 417. *Pence*.—A contracted form from *pennies*; and collective rather than plural. *Sixpence*, compared with *sixpences*, is no plural, but a singular form.

Dice.—This distinguishes *dice* for play from *dies* (*diez*) for coining. *Dice*, perhaps, like *pence*, is collective rather than plural.

Eaves.—In A. S. *efese*: so that *-s* belongs to the root.

Alms.—In Anglo-Saxon *ælmesse*.

Riches.—Most writers say *riches* are *useful*; in which case the word *riches* is plural. Still there are a few who say, *riches* is *useful*; in which case the word *riches* is singular. The *-s* is no sign of the plural number, since there is no such *substantive* as *rich*; on the contrary, it is part of the original singular, like the *-s* in *distress*. Notwithstanding this, we cannot say *riches-es* in the same way that we can say *distress-es*. Hence the word *riches* is, in respect to its original form, singular; in respect to its meaning, either singular or plural—most frequently the latter.

News.—Some say, *this news* is *good*; in which case the word *news* is singular. More rarely we find the expression *these news* are *good*; in which case the word *news* is plural. Now in the word *news* the *-s* (unlike the *-s* in *alms* and *riches*) is no part of the original singular, but the sign of the plural, like the *s* in *trees*. Notwithstanding this, we cannot subtract the *s*, and say *new*, in the same way that we can form *tree* from *trees*. Hence the word *news* is, in respect to its original form, plural; in respect to its meaning, either singular or plural, most frequently the former.

Means.—Some say, *these means* are *useful*; in which case the word *means* is plural. Others say, *this means* is *useful*; in which case the word *mēans* is singular. Now in the word *means* the *-s* (unlike the *s* in *alms* and *riches*, but like the *s* in *news*) is no part of the original singular, but the sign of the plural, like the *s* in *trees*. The form in the original French, from which language the word is derived, is *moyen*, singular; *moyens*, plural. If we subtract from the word *means* the letter *s*, we say *mean*. Now as a singular form of the word *means*, with the sense it has in the phrase *ways and means*, there is, in the current English, no such word as *mean*, any more than there is such a word as *new* from *news*. But, in a different sense, there is the singular form *mean*; as in the phrase *the golden mean*, meaning *middle course*. Hence the word *means* is, in respect to its form, plural; in respect to its meaning, either singular or plural.

Pains.—Some say, *these pains* are *well-taken*: in which case the word *pains* is plural. Others say, *this pains* is *well-taken*; in which case the word *pains* is singular. The form in the original French, from which language the word is derived, is *peine*. The reasoning that has been applied to the word *means* is closely applicable to the word *pains*.

The same also applies to the word *amends*. The form in French is *amende*, without the *s*.

Mathematics, metaphysics, politics, ethics, optics, physics.—All the words in point are of Greek origin, and all are derived from a Greek adjective. Each is the name of some department of study, of some art, or of some science. As the words are Greek, so also are the sciences which they denote either of Greek origin, or else such as flourished in Greece. Let the arts and sciences of Greece be expressed, in Greek, by a substantive and an adjective combined, rather than by a simple

substantive; for instance, let it be the habit of the language to say the *musical art*, rather than *music*. Let the Greek for *art* be a word in the feminine gender; *e.g.* τέχνη (*tekhnaē*), so that the *musical art* be ἡ μουσική τέχνη (*hæ mousikæ tekhnæ*). Let, in the progress of language (as was actually the case in Greece), the article and substantive be omitted, so that, for the *musical art*, or for *music*, there stand only the feminine adjective, μουσική. Let there be, upon a given art or science, a series of books, or treatises; the Greek for *book*, or *treatise*, being a neuter substantive, βιβλίον (*biblion*). Let the substantive meaning *treatise* be, in the course of language, omitted; so that whilst the science of *physics* is called φυσική (*fysikæ*), from ἡ φυσική τέχνη, a series of treatises upon the science shall be called φύσις (*fysika*) or *physics*. Now all this is what happened in Greece. The science was denoted by a feminine adjective singular, as φυσική (*fysikæ*), and the treatises upon it by the neuter adjective plural, as φύσις (*fysika*). I conceive, then, that, in the Middle Ages, a science of Greek origin might have its name drawn from two sources, viz. from the name of the art or science, or from the name of the books wherein it was treated. In the first case it had a singular form, as *physic*, *logic*; in the second, a plural, as *mathematics*, *metaphysics*, *optics*.

CHAPTER XXV.

ADJECTIVES.—AT PRESENT UNDECLINED.—ORIGINALLY DECLINED.—VIRTUAL CASES.

§ 418. At the present time, the English adjective is wholly destitute of Inflection. In A. S. it was not only

declined, but it had two declensions; one Indefinite, and one Definite. The former ran thus:—

Singular.

	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>	<i>Neuter.</i>
<i>Nominative.</i>	Gód	Gód	Gód
<i>Accusative.</i>	Gódne	Góde	Gód
<i>Ablative.</i>	Góde	Gódre	Góde
<i>Dative.</i>	Gódum	Gódre	Gódum
<i>Genitive.</i>	Gódes	Gódre	Gódes.

Plural.

	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>	<i>Neuter.</i>
<i>Nominative.</i>	Góde	Góde	Góde
<i>Accusative.</i>	Góde	Góde	Góde
<i>Ablative.</i>	Gódum	Gódum	Gódum
<i>Dative.</i>	Gódum	Gódum	Gódum
<i>Genitive.</i>	Gódra	Gódra	Gódra.

The Definite Declension, which was used, when the Adjective was preceded by either the Definite article or a Demonstrative Pronoun, was characterized by the predominance of the forms in *-n*. Thus:—

Singular.

	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>	<i>Neuter.</i>
<i>Nominative.</i>	Góde	Góda	Góde
<i>Accusative.</i>	Gódan	Gódan	Gódan
<i>Ablative.</i>	Gódan	Gódan	Gódan
<i>Dative.</i>	Gódan	Gódan	Gódan
<i>Genitive.</i>	Gódan	Gódan	Gódan.

Plural.

	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>	<i>Neuter.</i>
<i>Nominative.</i>	Gódan	Gódan	Gódan
<i>Accusative.</i>	Gódan	Gódan	Gódan
<i>Ablative.</i>	Gódum	Gódum	Gódum
<i>Dative.</i>	Gódum	Gódum	Gódum
<i>Genitive.</i>	Gódena	Gódena	Gódena.

The Declension of the Participle was, in the main, that of the Adjective.

Singular.

	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>	<i>Neuter.</i>
<i>Nominative.</i>	Bærand	Bærand	Bærand
<i>Accusative.</i>	Bærandne	Bærande	Bærand
<i>Ablative.</i>	Bærande	Bærandre	Bærande
<i>Dative.</i>	Bærandum	Bærandre	Bærandum
<i>Genitive.</i>	Bærandes	Bærandre	Bærandes.

Plural.

	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>	<i>Neuter.</i>
<i>Nominative.</i>	Bærande	Bærande	Bærande
<i>Accusative.</i>	Bærande	Bærande	Bærande
<i>Ablative.</i>	Bærandum	Bærandum	Bærandum
<i>Dative.</i>	Bærandum	Bærandum	Bærandum
<i>Genitive.</i>	Bærandra	Bærandra	Bærandra.

§ 419. This fulness of inflection of both the Adjective and the Participle, during the Anglo-Saxon period, contrasts with the utter absence of declension at the present moment, and may serve as an illustration of what we may call *virtual*, as opposed to *actual*, inflections. An adjective agreeing with a substantive, denoting a male, is *virtually* in the masculine gender, inasmuch as, if there were such a thing, at the present time, as the sign of gender, it would take that of the masculine. It really did this in an earlier stage of the language. The same applies to the questions of Number and Case. Adjectives agreeing with Substantives in the Plural Number, or the Possessive Case are virtually Possessive and Plural Adjectives. The same applies to Participles.

§ 420.

Examples of the Plural forms of Adjectives.

1. In these lay a gret multitude of *syke* men, *blinde*, *crokid*, and *drye*.
—WICLIFFE, John v.

In all the orders foure is none that can
So much of dalliance and faire language,
He hadde ymade ful many a marriage—
His tippet was ay farsed ful of knives,
And pinnes for to given *faire* wives.

CHAUCER, *Prol.*

2. And *al* the cuntre of Judee wente out to him, and *alle* men of Jerusalem.—WICLIFFE, Mark i.

4. He ghyueth lif to *alle* men, and brething, and *alle* thingis ; and made of von *al* kynde of men to inhabit on *al* the face of the erthe.—WICLIFFE, *Dedis of Apostlis*, xvii.

5. That fadres sone which *alle* thinges wrought ;
And *all*, that wrought is with a skilful thought,
The Gost that from the fader gan procede,
Hath souled hem.

CHAUCER, *The Second Nonnes Tale*.

6. And *alle* we that ben in this aray
And maken *all* this lamentation,
We losten *alle* our husbondes at that toun.

CHAUCER, *The Knightes Tale*.

7. A *good* man bryngeth forth *gode* thingis of *good* tresore.—WICLIFFE, *Matt.* vii.

8. So every *good* tree maketh *gode* fruytis, but an yvel tree maketh yvel fruytes. A *good* tree may not make yvel fruytis, neither an yvel tree may make *gode* fruytis. Every tree that maketh not *good* fruyt schal be cut down.—WICLIFFE, *Matt.* vii.

9. Men loveden more darknessis than light for her werkes weren *yvele*, for ech man that doeth *yvel*, hateth the light.—WICLIFFE, *John* iii.

CHAPTER XXVI.

VERBS.—FORMATION OF THE PAST TENSE.—CHANGE OF VOWEL.

§ 421. THE Verbs fall into two divisions. In the first the Past Tense is formed by changing the vowel, as *speak*, *spoke*. In the second it is formed by adding the sound of *-ed*, *-d*, or *-t*, as *plant-ed*, *move-d*, *wep-t*.

§ 422. The chief words which form the past tense by changing the vowel are—

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Past.</i>
	(Vowel <i>æ</i> .)
Fall	fell
Hold	held
Draw	drew
Slay	slew
Fly	flew
Blow	blew

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Past.</i>
Crow	crew
Know	knew
Grow	grew
(Vowel oo.)	
Shake	shook
Take	took
For-sake	for-sook

Two forms, one, marked with an asterisk (), obsolete.*

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Past.</i>	
rise	rose	*ris
smite	smote	smit
ride	rode	*rid
stride	strode	strid
slide	*slode	slid
chide	*chode	chid
drive	drove	*driv
thrive	throve	*thriv
write	wrote	writ
slit	*slat	slit
bite	*bat	bit
swim	swam	swam
begin	began	begun
spin	span	spun
sing	sang	sung
spring	sprang	sprung
sting	*stang	stung
ring	rang	rung
wring	*wrang	wrung
fling	*flang	flung
cling	*clang	clung
string	*strang	strung
sling	slang	slung
sink	sank	sunk
drink	drank	drunk
shrink	shrank	shrunk
stick	*stack	stuck
burst	*barst	burst
bind	*band	bound
find	*fand	found
grind	*grand	ground
wind	*wand	wound

For *barst* we occasionally find *brast*. The forms like *fand* are chiefly Scotch.

§ 423. In A. S., many words which now form their past tense in *-ed*, *-d*, or *-t*, formed it by the change of vowel.

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Existing Past.</i>	<i>A. S. Past</i>
Wreak	Wreaked	Wræ'c.
Fret	Fretted	Fræ't.
Mete	Meted	Mæ't.
Shear	Sheared	Scear.
Braid	Braided	Bræ'd.
Knead	Kneaded	Cnæ'd.
Dread	Dreaded	Dred.
Sleep	Slept	Slep.
Fold	Folded	Feold.
Wield	Wielded	Weold.
Wax	Waxed	Weox.
Leap	Leapt	Hleop.
Sweep	Swept	Sweop.
Weep	Wept	Weop.
Sow	Sowed	Seow.
Bake	Baked	Bók.
Gnaw	Gnawed	Gnóh.
Laugh	Laughed	Hlôh.
Wade	Waded	Wód.
Lade	Laded	Hlôh.
Grave	Graved	Gróf.
Shave	Shaved	Scof.
Step	Stepped	Stóp.
Wash	Washed	Wócs.
Bellow	Bellowed	Bealh.
Swallow	Swallowed	Swealh.
Mourn	Mourned	Mearn.
Spurn	Spurned	Spearn.
Carve	Carved	Cearf.
Starve	Starved	Stærf.
Thresh	Threshed	Thærso.
Hew	Hewed	Heow.
Flow	Flowed	Fleow.
Row	Rowed	Reow.

<i>'resent.</i>	<i>Existing Past.</i>	<i>A. S. Past</i>
Creep	Crept	Creáþ.
Dive	Dived	Deáf.
Shove	Shoved	Sceáf.
Chew	Chewed	Ceáw.
Brew	Brewed	Breáw.
Lock	Locked	Leác.
Suck	Sucked	Seác.
Reek	Reeked	Reác.
Smoke	Smoked	Smeác.
Bow	Bowed	Beáh.
Lie	Lied	Leáh.
Gripe	Griped	Gráp.
Span	Spanned	Spén.
Eke	Eked	Eóc.
Fare	Fared	Fòr.

§ 424. *Origin of the forms resulting from a change of vowel.*—In the Mæso-Gothic, the verbs in six out of the twelve classes, over which, in that language, they are distributed, form the past tense by the reduplication of the initial consonant. In the last two there is a change of vowel as well.

<i>Present.</i>		<i>Past.</i>
<i>Salta</i>	<i>sáisalt</i>	<i>leapt.</i>
<i>Háita</i>	<i>háiháit</i>	<i>called.</i>
<i>Hláupa</i>	<i>hláiláup</i>	<i>ran.</i>
<i>Slépa</i>	<i>sáizlêp</i>	<i>slept.</i>
<i>Láia</i>	<i>láið</i>	<i>laughed</i>
<i>Grêta</i>	<i>gáigrót</i>	<i>wept.</i>

It is not only believed that the past forms of the existing English have grown out of these reduplicate prototypes, but that, in two words, the reduplication still exists.

§ 425. *Did.*—*In did* from *do* = *facio*, with its participle *done*, the final *-d* is not the same as the *-d* in *moved*. What is it? There are good grounds for believing that it is an instance of this same old *reduplicate præterite* now

under notice. If so, it is the latter *d* which is radical, and the former which is inflectional.

§ 426. *Hight*.—The following couplet from Dryden's *Mac Flecnoe* exhibits a form as well as a construction which requires explanation.

An ancient fabric, raised t' inform the sight,
There stood of yore, and Barbican *it hight*.

Here the word *hight* = *was called*, and seems to present an instance of the participle being used in the passive sense without the so-called verb substantive. Yet it does no such thing. The word is no participle at all; but a simple præterite. Certain verbs are *naturally* either passive or active, as one of two allied meanings may predominate. *To be called* is passive; so is, *to be beaten*. But *to bear as a name* is active; so is, *to take a beating*. The word *hight* is of the same class of verbs with the Latin *vapulo*; and it is the same as the Latin word, *cluo*. *Barbican cluit* = *Barbican audivit* = *Barbican it hight*. So much for the question as to the construction, which is properly a point of syntax rather than etymology. In respect to the form, it must be observed that the *t* is no sign of the præterite tense, but, on the contrary, a part of the original word, which is, in German, *heiss-en*, in Norse, *het-a*, and *ked-e*. In A. S. this præterite was *heht*, and as the M. G. was *háiháit*, the form has been looked upon as reduplicate. Whatever may be its origin, the present spelling is inaccurate. The *g* has no business where it is; it being only the false analogy of the words *high* and *height* that has introduced it.

§ 427. That this reduplication is the reduplication of the Greek words like *τί-τυφα*, and the Latin ones like *mo-mordi*, is generally admitted. Such being the case, the words like *sáísalt* are, in respect to their history, neither more nor less than Perfects.

§ 428. A line of criticism is suggested by them, which, though it lies in the back-ground, is important; not so much, however, in its results as in its moral. It reads us a lesson against over-hasty generalization. Few persons believe that the change of vowel is spontaneous, *i. e.* that it came of itself, independent of anything which either preceded or followed it. Reasons for this may be found in § 336. They suggest the notion that changes of vowel are, as a general rule, secondary processes. Seeing no reason for believing that they are *never* primary, I agree with my predecessors on this point, in the main. The only question, then, that now remains, is the *direction* of the influence. In *rather*, from *hraðor*, it is clear that the influence has been *retrogressive*; in other words, that the affix has acted on what went before it. The converse, however, was possible, and a state of things is imaginable in which it shall be the first of two vowels which shall determine the character of the second; in which case the direction would be forwards rather than backwards, and the action of the vowel *progressive*. With this alternative as a philological possibility, it is easy to see that a generalization of a wide kind is also possible. It may be that certain languages—nay, certain classes of languages—are characterized by the difference of the direction of the action of their constituent sounds; some giving a progressive, some a retrogressive system of accommodation. It may now be added that this is no supposition, but, to a great extent, a reality. In the German languages the direction is retrogressive rather than progressive. In the languages allied to the Fin and Turkish, the direction is progressive rather than retrogressive. Such is the rule in the main: but that it is not a rule absolute may be seen in the words under notice. The influence which changed *greta* into *gaigrot* is certainly progressive. For a German language, however,

the *progress* is an exceptionable phenomenon ; though the converse is the exception in the *Fin* and *Turk*.

CHAPTER XXVII.

FORMATION OF THE PAST TENSE.—ADDITION OF *-ED*, *-D*, OR *-T*.

§ 429. THE current statement that the syllable *-ed*, rather than the letter *-d*, is the sign of the præterite tense, is true only in regard to the written language. In *stabbed*, *moved*, *bragged*, *whizzed*, *judged*, *filled*, *slurred*, *slammed*, *shunned*, *barred*, *strewed*, the *e* is a point of spelling only, for in *language* (except in declamation) there is no second vowel sound. The *-d* comes in immediate contact with the final letter of the original word, and the number of syllables remains the same as it was before.

§ 430. When, however, the original word ends in *-d* or *-t*, as *slight* or *brand*, then, and then only (and that not always), is there the addition of the syllable *-ed* ; as in *slighted*, *branded*. This is necessary, since the combinations *slightt* and *brandd* are unpronounceable.

§ 431. Whether the addition be *-d*, or *-t* depends upon the sonancy or surdness of the preceding letter. After, *b*, *v*, *th* (as in *clothe*), *g*, or *z*, the addition is *-d*. This is a matter of necessity. We say *stabd*, *môvd*, *clôthd*, *braggd*, *whizzd*, because *stabt*, *môvt*, *clôtht*, *braggt*, *whizzt*, are unpronounceable. After, *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *w*, *y*, or a vowel, the addition is also *-d*. This is no matter of necessity, but simply the *habit* of the English language. *Filt*, *shurt*, *strayt*, &c. are as pronounceable as *filld*, *shurrd*, *strayd*, &c. It is the habit, however, of the English language to prefer the latter forms.

§ 432. The verbs of this class fall into three sections. In the first, there is a simple addition of *-d*, *-t*, or *-ed*.

Serve	served.	Dip	dipped (<i>dīpt</i>).
Cry	cried.	Slip	slipped (<i>slīpt</i>).
Betray	betrayed.	Step	stepped (<i>stept</i>).
Expel	expelled.	Look	looked (<i>lookt</i>).
Accuse	accused.	Pluck	plucked (<i>plūckt</i>).
Instruct	instructed.	Toss	tossed (<i>tost</i>).
Invite	invited.	Push	pushed (<i>pusht</i>).
Waste	wasted.	Confess	confessed (<i>confest</i>).

§ 433. In the second, besides the addition of *-t* or *-d*, the vowel is *shortened*. It also contains those words which end in *-d*, or *-t*, and at the same time have a short vowel in the præterite. Such, amongst others, are *cut*, *cost*, &c., where the two tenses are alike, and *bend*, *rend*, &c., where the præterite is formed from the present by changing *-d* into *-t*, as *bent*, *rent*, &c.

§ 434. In the third, the vowel is *changed*.

Tell	told.	Sell	sold.
Will	would.	Shall	should.

To this group belong the remarkable præterites of the verbs *seek*, *beseech*, *catch*, *teach*, *bring*, *think*, and *buy*, viz. *sought*, *besought*, *caught*, *taught*, *brought*, *thought*, and *bought*. In all these, the final consonant is either *g* or *k*, or else a sound allied to those mutes. When the tendency of these to become *h* and *y*, as well as to undergo further changes, is remembered, the forms in point cease to seem anomalous. In *wrought*, from *work*, there is a transposition. In *laid* and *said* the present forms make a show of regularity which they have not. The true original forms should be *legde* and *sægde*, the infinitives being *lecgan*, *secgan*. In these words the *i* represents the semi-vowel *y*, into which the original *g*

was changed. The Anglo-Saxon forms of the other words are as follows:—

Byegan	bóhte.	Bringan	bróhte.
Sécan	sóhte.	þencan	þohte.
	Wyrcand	wórthe.	

§ 435. Out of the three groups into which the Verbs under notice in Anglo-Saxon are divided, only one takes a vowel before the *d* or *t*. The other two add the syllables *-te*, or *-de*, to the last letter of the original word. The vowel that, in one out of the three Anglo-Saxon classes, precedes *d* is *o*. Thus we have *lufian*, *lufode*; *clypian*, *clypode*. In the other two classes the forms are respectively *bærnan*, *bærnde*; and *tellan*, *tealde*: no vowel being inserted.

§ 436. In the present English, with several verbs there is the actual addition of the syllable *-ed*; in other words, *d* is separated from the last letter of the original word by the addition of a vowel; as *ended*, *instructed*, &c.

In several verbs the final *-d* is changed into *-t*, as *bend*, *bent*; *rend*, *rent*; *send*, *sent*; *gild*, *gilt*; *build*, *built*; *spend*, *spent*, &c.

§ 437. Herein we see a series of expedients for separating the præterite form from the present, when the root ends with the same sound with which the affix begins.

The change from a long vowel to a short one, as in *feed*, *fed*, &c., can only take place where there is a long vowel to be changed.

Where the vowels are short, and, at the same time, the word ends in *d*, the *d* of the present may become *t* in the præterite. Such is the case with *bend*, *bent*.

Where there is no long vowel to shorten, and no *d* to change into *t*, the two tenses (unless we add *-ed*), of necessity, remain alike. Such is the case with *cut*, *cost*, &c., &c.

§ 438. With forms like *fed* and *led* we are in doubt as to the class. This doubt we have three means of settling.

1. *By the form of the Participle.*—The *-en* in *beaten* shows that the word *beat* is in the same class as *spoke*.

2. *By the nature of the Vowel.*—If *beat* were conjugated like *read*, its Præterite would be *bet*.

3. *By a knowledge of the older forms.*—The A. S. is *beáte*, *beot*. There is no such a form as *beáte*, *bætte*. The præterite of *sendan* is *sende*. There is in A. S. no such form as *sand*.

§ 439. Certain so-called irregularities may now be noticed.

Made, had.—In these words there is nothing remarkable but the ejection of a consonant. The Anglo-Saxon forms are *macode* and *hæfdē*, respectively.

Would, should, could.—It must not be imagined that *could* is in the same predicament with these words. In *will* and *shall* the *-l* is part of the original word. This is not the case with *can*.

Yode.—Instead of *goed*, a regular præterite from *go*, now obsolete, and replaced by *went*, the præterite of *wend*,—*he wends his way—he went his way*. Except that the initial *g* has become *y*, and the *e* follows instead of preceding the *d* (a mere point of spelling), there is nothing peculiar in this word.

For *aught*, *minded*, and *did*, see the following chapters.

§ 440. The origin of the form in *-d* is considered, by Grimm and others, to lie in the word *do*; of which the Præterite is *d-d*. The Mæso-Gothic, in the Dual and Plural of the Indicative, and in all the persons of the Conjunctive Mood, gives us the form in full, *i. e.* the two *d*'s. Having noted this, note also, the existence of expressions like *we did speak*, *we did write*, and the like; and the plausibility of the suggestion will become apparent.

Note, too, the greater antiquity of the reduplicate forms; inasmuch as before *did* could be attached to such a root as *nas-*, it would, itself, have been deduced from *do*.

INDICATIVE.		
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Dual.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
(1.) <i>nasida</i>	—	<i>nasidédum</i>
(2.) <i>nasides</i>	<i>nasidéduts</i>	<i>nasidédup</i>
(3.) <i>nasida</i>	—	<i>nasidédum</i>
CONJUNCTIVE.		
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Dual.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
(1.) <i>nasidédjau</i>	—	<i>nasidédeima</i>
(2.) <i>nasidédeis</i>	<i>nasidédeits</i>	<i>nasidédeip</i>
(3.) <i>nasidédi</i>	—	<i>nasidédeina</i>

§ 441. Some remarks, however, of Dr. Trithen on the Slavonic præterite, induce me to entertain a different doctrine, and to identify the *-d* under notice with the *-t* of the passive participles of the Latin language, as found in *mon-it-us*, *voc-at-us*, *rap-t-us*, and probably in the Greek forms like *τυφ-θ-είς*.

1. The Slavonic præterite is commonly said to possess genders: in other words, there is one form for speaking of a past action when done by a male, and another for speaking of a past action when done by a female.

2. These forms are identical with those of the participles, masculine and feminine, as the case may be. Indeed the præterite is a participle. If, instead of saying *ille amavit*, the Latins said *ille amatus*, whilst, instead of saying *illa amavit*, they said *illa amata*, they would exactly use the grammar of the Slavonic.

3. Hence, as one class of languages, at least, gives us the undoubted fact of an active præterite being identical with a passive participle, and as the participle and præterite in question are nearly identical, we have a fair reason for believing that the *d*, in the English active præterite, is the *d* of the participle, which, in its turn, is the *t* of the Latin passive participle. The following ex-

tract, however, gives Dr. Trithen's remarks on the Slavonic verb in his own words :—

A peculiarity which distinguishes the grammar of all the Slavish languages consists in the use of the past participle, taken in an active sense, for the purpose of expressing the præterite. This participle generally ends in *-l*; and much uncertainty prevails both as to its origin and its relations, though the termination has been compared by various philologists with similar affixes in the Sanscrit, and the classical languages.

In the Old-Slavish, or the language of the church, there are three methods of expressing the past tense: one of them consists in the union of the verb substantive with the participle; as—

<i>Rek esm'</i>	<i>chital esm'</i>
<i>Rek esi'</i>	<i>chital esi'</i>
<i>Rek est'</i>	<i>chital est.</i>

In the corresponding tense of the Slavonic dialect we have the verb substantive placed before the participle:—

<i>Ya sam imao</i>	<i>mi' smo imali</i>
<i>Ti si imao</i>	<i>vi' ste imali</i>
<i>On ye imao</i>	<i>omi su imali.</i>

In the Polish it appears as a suffix:—

<i>Czytalem</i>	<i>czytalismy</i>
<i>Czytales</i>	<i>czytaliscie</i>
<i>Czytal</i>	<i>czytalie</i>

And in the Servian it follows the participle:—

<i>Igrao sam</i>	<i>igrali smo</i>
<i>Igrao si</i>	<i>igrali ste</i>
<i>Igrao ye</i>	<i>igrali su.</i>

The ending *-ao*, of *igrao* and *imao*, stands for the Russian *al*, as in some English dialects *a'* is used for *all*.

The præterite in *-d* may be compared with the Greek aorists and with the Latin form in *-si*; as *rex*i, *vix*i = *rek-si*, *vic-si*, in power, and in respect to its relation to the perfect; though not in origin.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

ON IRREGULARITY AND DEFECT.

§ 442. WHATEVER the verbs which form the Past Tense by changing the vowel may be, they are anything but *Irregular*—though they are often treated as if they were. *Irregular*, however, is a word which we should use as seldom as possible. The better the grammarian the fewer the irregularities of his grammar. If it were not so, the phenomena of language would scarcely be worth studying. It is evident, however, that it is in the power of the grammarian to raise the number of etymological irregularities to any amount, by narrowing the definition of the word *irregular*; in other words, by framing an exclusive rule. The current rule of the common grammarians is that the præterite is formed *by the addition of -t or -d, or -ed*. Now this position is sufficiently exclusive; since it proscribes not only the whole class of verbs, like *spoke*, but also words like *bent* and *sent*, where *-t* exists, but where it does not exist as *an addition*. The regular forms, it may be said, should be *bended* and *sended*. Exclusive, however, as the rule in question is, it is plain that it might be made more so. The regular forms might, by the *flat* of a rule, be restricted to those in *-d*. In this case, words like *wept* and *burnt* would be added to the already numerous list of irregulars. Finally, a further limitation might be made, by laying down as a rule that no word was regular, unless it ended in *-ed*.

§ 443. Thus much concerning the modes of making rules exclusive, and, consequently, of raising the amount of irregularities—the last art that the philosophic grammarian is ambitious of acquiring. True etymology reduces irregularity by making the rules of grammar not exclusive, but general. The *quantum* of irregularity is

in the inverse proportion to the generality of our rules. In language itself there is no irregularity. The word itself is only another name for our ignorance of the processes that change words; and, as irregularity is in the direct proportion to the exclusiveness of our rules, the exclusiveness of our rules is in the direct proportion to our ignorance of etymological processes. The nearest approach to a true Irregularity in the English language is to be found in the word *could*, from *can*; where the *l* is wholly inorganic, being foreign to the root; and only introduced to match the *l* in *should* and *would*. But even here it is not sounded: so that the Irregularity, such as it is, is an Irregularity of spelling rather than speaking.

§ 444. *Quoth* is Defective,—only, however, in the present stage of our language. The A. S. present was *cweðe*, existing, at the present moment, in the compound word *bequeathe*. In *go* and *went* we have Defect and Complement.

§ 445. In claiming for the forms like *spoke* their due amount of regularity, we improve upon the grammarians of the last century. The exact import, however, of the two classes has yet to be determined. The German philologues make out of the two classes two different Conjugations; one of which is called *Strong*, the other *Weak*. The words like *spoke* are strong, because they are formed from their present tenses by a merely internal change, *i.e.* a change of the vowel—no new element being added. Meanwhile, *called*, and its fellows, require the addition of a totally new sound—that of *-d*, *-t*, or *-ed*, as the case may be; this being, somewhat fancifully, treated as a sign of debility. That these classes, however, (call them what we will) are natural is beyond a doubt.

(a) The so-called Strong Verbs are of English, and few, or none, of foreign, origin.

(b) Strong words (so-called) become weak. Weak words (so-called) do *not* become strong. Hence, the later the stage of a given language, the fewer are the strong forms. Then, as the provincial dialects retain many archaisms, it is only natural to expect that they will partially agree with the A. S. rather than the modern English. Hence, if we find (as we actually do), instead of (say) *leapt, slept, mowed, snowed*, &c. such forms as *lep, slep, mew, snew*, it is no more than we expect.

(c) The verbs which are strong in any one of the German languages are generally so in all the rest.

(d) Derived words are weak rather than strong. The intransitive forms *drink* and *lie*, are strong; the transitive forms *drench* and *lay*, are weak.

(e) No new word forms its past tense by a change of vowel. One of our earliest Norman-French verbs is *adouber* = *dubb*. Its past tense is *dubb-ade*.

§ 446. That these classes are natural is beyond a doubt; in other words, there is no doubt as to their being genuine classes—classes of some sort or other. This was recognized as early as the time of Ben Jonson, who, unlike the majority of his followers, was unwilling to see irregularity where irregularity had no real existence. So far, indeed, as he saw it at all, he saw it on the side of the form in *-d*, which he called a “common inn to lodge every strange and foreign guest,” hereby using a metaphor which shows how clearly he had seen the extent to which the one process was current, the other obsolete. In regard to the class under notice, he writes—

“That which followeth, for anything I can find (though I have with some diligence searched after it), entertaineth none but natural and homeborn words, which, though in number they be not many, a hundred and twenty, or thereabouts, yet in variation are so divers and uncertain that they need much the stamp of some good logic to beat them into proportion. We have set down that, that in our judgement agreeth best with reason and good order. Which notwithstanding, if it seem to any

to be too rough hewed, let him plane it out more smoothly ; and I shall not only not envy it, but, in the behalf of my country, most heartily thank him for so great a benefit ; hoping that I shall be thought sufficiently to have done my part, if, in tolling this bell, I may draw others to a deeper consideration of the matter : for, touching myself, I must needs confess, that after much painful churning, this only would come."

The bell, however, was tolled in vain. Wallis demurred to his doctrine, having devoted a special chapter to the consideration of what he called the *Verba anomalia*.

De Verbis Anomalis.

Restat ut de Verborum aliquot Anomalia pauca tradam. De quibus hæc duo primitus monenda sunt.

1. Tota quæ sequitur Anomalia non nisi præteriti Imperfecti temporis, et Participii Passivi formationem spectat. Nam in ipsis quidem Verbis Irregularibus nihil aliud irregulare est.

2. Tota illa quantacunque Anomalia, Verba Exotica vix omnino attingit, sed illa sola quæ Nativa sunt. — Exotica vero illa appello quæ a Latinis, Gallicis, Italicis, Hispanicis, aut etiam Cambro-Britannicis deduximus, quæ quidem multa sunt : Nativa vero illa voco quæ ab antiqua lingua Teutonica, seu Saxonica, originem ducunt ; quæ quidem omnia sunt Monosyllaba (aut saltem a Monosyllabis deducta), et plerumque nobis cum Germanis, Belgis, Danis, etc. communia sunt (levi saltem immutatione facta) ; quorum nempe sive Linguae sive Dialectus ejusdem cum nostra Anglicana sunt originis.

Anomalia prima, quæ maxime generalis est, ex celeritate pronunciandi originem duxit : nempe (post syncopen vocalis *e* in regulari terminatione *ed*), relicta consona *d* sæpiissime mutatur in *t* ; quoties scilicet pronuntiatio sic evadit expeditior (et quidem contractio potius dicenda videtur, quam Anomalia).

Anomalia secunda etiam frequens est, sed solummodo Participium Passivum spectat : Nempe Participium Passivum olim sæpiissime formabatur in *en* : Cujusmodi satis multa adhuc retinemus, præsertim ubi Præteritum Imperfectum insignem aliquam anomaliam patitur (atque hæc quidem Altera Participii Formatio, potius quam Anomalia, non incommode dici potest).

Sunt et aliæ Anomaliæ non paucae, præsertim in Præterito Imperfecto ; sed quæ magis speciales sunt, nec quidem adeo multæ quam ut possint sigillatim recenseri.

He notices, however, the fact of the so-called Irregulars being exclusively English.

Hickes, after giving a single conjugation for the Anglo-

Saxon verbs, throws the rest into a single class, with the remark, however, that they follow a principle of their own, along with the additional suggestion that *forsan magis proprie secundam conjugationem constituere videntur quam inter anomalia recenseri*. Little, however, came of this until lately. In a paper upon certain tenses, attributed to the Greek verb in the *Philological Museum*,* it is argued that the so-called second aorist, and second future, are in the same category with the so-called English Irregulars.

We may find a satisfactory illustration of this matter in our own language. In English also there are two originally distinct modes of forming the common past tense : the first by adding the syllable *ed*, as in *I killed* : the other, chiefly by certain changes in the vowels, as in *I wrote, I saw, I knew, I ran* ; and many others. Let the reader call the former and regular form the first aorist, and the latter the second, and he will have a correct idea of the amount of the distinction between those tenses in Greek. The form *ἔτυψα* in Greek is what *I killed* is in English, that is, the regular form of the past tense, which obtains in the vast majority of verbs : the form *ἔλαβον*, on the other hand, is altogether analogous to *I took*, or *I saw*, acknowledged by all grammarians not as a second or distinct preterite, but as an instance of irregular variety of formation obtaining in certain verbs.

But some will probably deem it an objection to the view here taken that there are verbs in Greek,—many, they perhaps suppose,—in which both forms of the aorist are in use together. I admit that a few instances of this kind do occur ; but even in this point we shall find that the analogy with our own language still holds good. Without rummaging in old authors, we meet with many instances in which English verbs retain both forms of the preterite. Thus, for example, we may say, *I hanged*, or *I hung* ; *I chid*, or *I chode* ; *I spit*, or *I spat* ; *I climbed*, or *I clomb* ; *I awaked*, or *I awoke* ; *I cleft*, *I clave*, or *I clove* ; and a score of others. Except in their greater abundance, wherein do these differ from the analogous duplicate forms of the Greek aorist, such as *ἔκτανε* and *ἔταναν*, *I killed* ; *ἔτυψα* and *ἔτυπον*, *I struck* ; *ἠθάμβησα* and *ἔταφον*, *I was astonished* ? Such duplicates in Greek are extremely rare : probably there is not one Greek verb in five hundred in which they can be met with. The form improperly called the second aorist is, indeed, common enough ; but then, where it exists, that of the first aorist is almost always wanting. We have *ἔσεν*, *ἔλάβον*, *ἔδον*, *ἤγαγον*, *ἔλαπον*, *ἔδραμον* ; but the regular form is as much a nonentity in these verbs, as it is in the English

* Vol. ii. pp. 193-226.

verbs, *I found, I took, I saw, I led, I left, I ran.* The first aorist in these would be sheer vulgarity ; it would be parallel to *I finded, I taked, I seed.*

Now if the circumstances of the Greek and English, in regard to these two tenses, are so precisely parallel, a simple and obvious enquiry arises. Which are in the right, the Greek Grammarians or our own ? For either ours must be wrong in not having fitted up for our verb the framework of a first and second preterite, teaching the pupils to say 1st pret. *I finded*, 2nd pret. *I found* ; 1st pret. *I glided*, 2nd pret. *I glode* ; or the others must be so in teaching the learner to imagine two aorists for *εὑρίσκω*, as aor. 1. *εὗρηκα*, aor. 2. *εἶπον* ; or for *ἀνίσταμαι*, as aor. 1. *ἤνυστα*, aor. 2. *ἤνοιον*.

To this paper (signed T. F. B.) is attached a long editorial note, by C. J. H. (Charles Julius Hare), who would reverse the suggested process, and improve English grammar by the recognition of the double conjugation. Soon after, Mr. Kemble, in his paper on the English Præterites,* went further in the same direction. The present writer, owing much to these two writers, and, especially to the papers in question, was, until lately, satisfied to follow them—approving of, and using, the terms *Conjugation, Weak and Strong.* But what do they come to ? Can we, as a matter of fact, make such forms as *swoll* and *swelled, hung* and *hanged*, and a few others, differ from each other, in the one being *transitive*, the other *intransitive* ? Can *hung*=*pendit*, whilst *hanged*=*suspendit* ? Can *swoll*=*tumuit*, whilst *swelled*=*tumefecit* ? Should we cultivate such distinctions as the following?—(1) I *hanged* him up and there he *hung*. (2) I *swelled* the number of his followers, which *swoll*, at last, to a thousand. The forms like—

<i>Drink</i>	and	<i>Drank</i> ,	as	opposed	to	<i>Drench</i>	and	<i>Drenched</i> ,
<i>Lie</i>	—	<i>Lay</i>	—		—	<i>Lay</i>	—	<i>Laid</i> ,
<i>Rise</i>	—	<i>Rose</i>	—		—	<i>Raise</i>	—	<i>Raised</i> ,

are, more or less, confirmatory. Yet they are anything

* Phil. Mus., vol. ii. pp. 378-388.

but conclusive. All that they tell us is, *that when we have two forms*, one primitive and intransitive, and the other derivative and transitive, it is the former which is strong rather than weak, and the latter which is weak rather than strong; the words being used in the sense suggested by the writers last mentioned.

What do they come to? If two tenses, meaning exactly the same thing, are a philological tautology, two conjugations are the same; and, if so, nothing is got by assuming them. Considering the origin of the forms like *spoke*, it is, surely, safe to put them, as has been suggested, in the same category with Latin words like *mo-mordi*, or *cu-curri*, or (still better), with words like *cepi* from *ce-cepi*. What, then, are these Latin words? a reference to the Greek gives the answer. In Greek *τέτυφα* (*tetyfa*) = *I have beaten*; *ἔτυψα* (*etypsa*) = *I beat*. The first is formed by a reduplication of the initial *τ*, and, consequently, may be called the reduplicate form. As a tense, it is called the perfect. In *ἔτυψα* an *ε* is prefixed, and a *σ* is added. In the allied language of Italy the *ε* disappears, whilst the *σ* (*s*) remains. *ἔτυψα* is said to be an aorist tense. In Latin *scripsi* is to *scribo* as *ἔτυψα* is to *τύπτω*. But, in the Latin language a confusion takes place between these two tenses. Both forms exist. They are used, however, indiscriminately. The aorist form has, besides its own, the sense of the perfect. The perfect has, besides its own, the sense of the aorist. In the following pair of quotations, *vixi*, the aorist form, is translated *I have lived*, while *tetigit*, the perfect form, is translated *he touched*.

Vixi, et quem dederat cursum Fortuna peregi:
Et nunc magna mei sub terras ibit imago.—*Æn.* iv.
Ut primum alatis *tetigit* magalia plantis.—*Æn.* iv.

When a difference of form has ceased to express a

difference of meaning, it has become superfluous. This is the case with the two forms in question. One of them may be dispensed with; and the consequence is, that, although in the Latin language both the perfect and the aorist forms are found, they are, with few exceptions, never found in the same word. When there is the perfect, the aorist is wanting, and *vice versa*. The two ideas *I have struck* and *I struck* are merged into the notion of past time in general, and are expressed by one of two forms, sometimes by that of the Greek perfect, and sometimes by that of the Greek aorist. On account of this the grammarians have cut down the number of Latin tenses; forms like *cucurri* and *vixi* being dealt with as one and the same tense. The true view, however, is, that in *curro* the aorist form is replaced by the perfect, and in *vixi* the perfect form is replaced by the aorist. Hence, the history of such a pair of words as *drank* and *moved*, is the history of such a pair of words as *tetigi* and *vixi*. Now the place of these is that of τέτυχα and ἔτευνχα, i. e. they both belong to one and the same conjugation—of which, however, they are different tenses, one a perfect, the other an aorist. If so, what are our vowel-changing Præterites? Perfects modified in form by the loss of the reduplication, and changed in power by having 'adopted' that of the aorist. And what are our Præterites in -d? Aorists. The *Conjugation* is really one. The *Tense* is one in appearance only.

CHAPTER XXIX.

ON THE NUMBER OF VERBS.

§ 447. *Number and Person*.—As compared with *we love*, *ye love*, *they love*, both the Anglo-Saxon *we lufiað*,

ge lufiað, hi lufiað, and the Old English, *we loven, ye loven, they loven*, have a peculiar termination for the plural number which the present language wants. In other words, the Anglo-Saxon and the Old English have a plural *personal* characteristic, whilst the Modern English has nothing to correspond with it. The word *personal* is printed in italics. It does not follow, that, because there is no plural *personal* characteristic, there is, also, no plural characteristic. There is no reason against the inflection of the word *love* running thus:—*I love, thou lovest, he loves; we lave, ye lave, they lave*; in other words, there is no reason against the vowel of the root being changed with the number. In such a case there would be no *personal*, though there would be a plural, or a *numeral*, inflection. Now, in Anglo-Saxon, with a great number of verbs such a plural inflection not only actually takes place, but takes place most regularly. It takes place, however, in the past tense only. And this is the case in all the German languages as well as in Anglo-Saxon.

§ 448. The details of the persons in the different German languages are as follows:—

Present Tense, Indicative Mood.

Old High-German.

1st person.		2nd person.	3rd person.
<i>Sing.</i>	Prennu.	Prennis.	Prennit— <i>burn</i>
<i>Plur.</i>	Prennames.	Prennat.	Prennant.

Icelandic.

<i>Sing.</i>	Kalla.	Kallar.	Kallar— <i>call</i> .
<i>Plur.</i>	Köllum.	Kalliþ.	Kalla.

Old Saxon.

<i>Sing.</i>	Sôkju.	Sôkis.	Sôkid— <i>seek</i> .
<i>Plur.</i>	Sôkjad.	Sôkjad.	Sôkjad.

<i>Anglo-Saxon.</i>		
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Lufige.</i>	<i>Lufast.</i>
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Lufiað.</i>	<i>Lufiað.</i>
<i>Old English.</i>		
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Love.</i>	<i>Lovest.</i>
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Loven.*</i>	<i>Loven.*</i>
<i>Modern English.</i>		
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Love.</i>	<i>Lovest.</i>
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Love.</i>	<i>Loveth (or Loves).</i>

§ 449. *I call*.—The word *call* is not one person more than another. It is the simple verb wholly uninflected.

Thou callest.—The final *-t* appears throughout the West-Saxon, although wanting in the Northumbrian and Old Saxon. In Old High-German it is commoner in some authors than in others. In Middle High-German and New High-German it is universal.

He calls.—The *-s* in *calls* is the *-th* in *callest*, changed.

§ 450. *Thou spakest, thou brakest, thou sungest*.—In these forms there is a slight though natural anomaly. The second singular præterite in A. S. was formed not in *-st*, but in *-e*; as *pú funde*=*thou foundest*, *pú sunge*=*thou sungest*. Hence the existing termination is derived from the present. Observe that this applies only to the præterites formed by changing the vowel. *Thou loved'st* is Anglo-Saxon as well as English, viz. *pú lufodest*. Again, in A. S., the vowel of the plural of certain (so-called) strong præterites was different from that of the singular. More than this—the vowel of the *second person singular* was *different* from that of the first and third, but the *same* as that of the plural. Hence

<i>Singular.</i>		<i>Plural.</i>
1. Ic sang.		1. We sungon.
2. þu sunge.		2. Ge sungon.
3. He sang.		3. Hi sungon.

This is, apparently, the conjugation of the A. S. Subjunctive, transferred to the Indicative.

Sing.	Anglo-Saxon.	
	Plur.	
Arn	urnon	run.
Ongan	ongunnon	begun.
Span	spunnon	spun.
Sang	sungon	sung.
Swang	swungon	swung.
Dranc	druncon	drunk.
Sanc	suncon	sunk.
Sprang	sprungon	we sprung.
Swam	swummon	we swum.
Rang	rungon	rung.

EXAMPLES.*

And the men that heelden him, scorniden him and *smyt*en him, and they blindfelden him and *smyt*en him, and seiden, Areed thou Christ to us, who is he that *smoot* thee?—WYCLIFFE, Luke xxii.

Sche *ran* and cam to Symound Petir and to a nother disciple—and thee twayne *runnen* togidre and thilk other disciple *ran* before Petir.—WYCLIFFE, John xx.

Anoon thei knewen him and thei *runnen* thorou al that countree and *begunnen* to bringe sik men.—WYCLIFFE, Mark vi.

We preieder Tite that as he *began* so also he perfourme in yhou this grace.—WYCLIFFE, 2 Cor. viii.

And the prince of prestis *roos* and seide to him.—WYCLIFFE, Matt. xxvi.

And summe of the farisees *risen* up and foughten, seyinge, &c.—WYCLIFFE, Deedis 23.

Alas, Custance, thou hast no champion,
But he that *starfe* for our redemption.

CHAUCER, *Man of Law's Tale*. 621.

For which they *storven* bothe two.

CHAUCER, *Pardoner's Tale*. 530.

CHAPTER XXX.

ON THE WORDS *DID* AND *BECAME*, CATACHRESTIC.

§ 451. *Did*, *catachrestic*.—In the phrase *this will do* = *this will answer the purpose*, the word *do* is wholly

* It is scarcely necessary to state that these, as well as the vast majority of the most apposite examples of the present work, are taken from Dr. Guest's valuable contributions to the Transactions of the Philological Society.

different from the word *do=act*. In the first case it is equivalent to the Latin *valere*, in the second to the Latin *facere*. Of the first, the Anglo-Saxon inflection is *deáh*, *dugon*, *dohte*, *dohtest*, &c. Of the second, it is *dó*, *doð*, *dyde*, &c. In the present Danish they write *duger*, but say *duer* : as *duger det noget?* = *Is it worth anything?* pronounced *dooer deh note?* This accounts for the ejection of the *g*. The Anglo-Saxon form *deáh* does the same.

In Robert of Bourne the præterite is *deih*.

Philip of Flaundres fleih, and turned sonne the bak :
And Thebald nouht he *deih*.—R. B. 133.

Philip of Flanders fled, and turned soon the back,
And Thebald *did no good*.—

The king Isaak fleih, his men had no foyson (*provisions*),
All that time he ne *deih*.—R. B. 159.

I'll laugh an' sing, an' shake my leg
As lung 's I *dow* (*am able*).—BURNS.

For cunning men I knaw will sone conclude
I *dow* nothing.

Sir D. Lyndsay, Complaint of the Papingo.

Thre yer in carebed lay,
Tristrem the truue he hight ;
Never ne *dought* him day,
For sorrow he had o' night.—*Sir Tristram*. 21.

Three year in carebed lay ;
Tristrem the true he hight ;
The day never *did him good*,
For the sorrow he had at night.

We cannot, however (although we ought), say *that doed well enough*, though a Dane says *det dugede nok*.

§ 452. *Became, catachrestic*.—The *catachresis*, abuse, or confusion between *do = valeo*, and *do = facio*, repeats itself with the verb *become*. When *become = fio*, its præterite is *became*. When *become = convenio = suit* (as in *that dress becomes you*), its præterite ought to be *becomed*. *Become = convenio*, is from the same root as the German *bequem = convenient*.

§ 453. *Overflown, catachrestic.*—There is another verb which has not yet gone wrong, but which is going. I have seen such sentences as *a field overflown with water*. No one, however, has (I hope) brought himself to say the *water overflow the field*. Nevertheless, the tendency to catachresis has set in.

CHAPTER XXXI.

ON CERTAIN APPARENT PRESENTS.

§ 454. THE connection between the perfect and present tenses requires notice. In many actions the connection between the cause and effect is so evident, that the word which expresses the former may also be used to denote the latter. Let us say, for instance, that a man *has appealed to his memory* upon a certain subject. Let us say that he *has taxed, has drawn upon it, has referred to it*. What is this but to say that he *has done* something, the *act so done* being an act of *past* time? Nevertheless, the effect of this act is present. The man who has *appealed to*, or *taxed his memory*, like the man who has *recalled his ideas*, may truly be said to *remember*. This is an act of *present* time. In like manner a man who *has got the facts* that bear upon any given question, may be said to *know* them. Further—the man who *has taken courage* or *made up his mind* to do a thing, *dares* to do it. The word *dares*, however, is present; whereas *has taken courage*, &c., is perfect. Again—*I have taken possession* of a house = *I am the possessor of it* = *I possess it* = *I own it*. Instances of this sort are numerous; few languages being without them. In Greek and Latin (for example) the words *οἶδα* and *memini* are rarely rendered *I have known*, and *I have remembered*, but *I know* and *I remember*. In English there are, at least, nine of these words—

(1) *dare* and *durst*, (2) *own* = *admit*, (3) *can*, (4) *shall*, (5) *may*, (6) *mun* and *mind*, (7) *wot*, (8) *ought*, (9) *must*. Of these, none presents any serious difficulties when we look at them simply in respect to their meaning. To four of them we see our way already: *dare* = *I have made up my mind*; *own* = *I have got possession of*; *mind* = *I have recollected my ideas*; and *wot* = *I have informed myself*, or *I know*. With the other five a similar train of reasoning gives us similar results.

Let *can* mean, *I have learned*, or *I have gotten information*, as a perfect, and it is easy to see that as a present it may mean *I am able*. If so, the apophthegm that *Knowledge is Power* is no new saying, but one that has been implicit in language for centuries. If so, the common expression *I will do all I know for all I can*, is not only justifiable, but laudable.

Let *own*, as in *I own to having done it*, mean *I have assented*, and it soon comes to mean *I grant*, *concede*, or *admit*.

Let *shall* mean *I have chosen* or *decided*, or let it mean *I have been determined*, and it soon comes to mean *I am in condition* to do so and so.

Let *may* = *I have gotten the power*, and it = *I am free* to do so and so.

Let *must* = *I have been constrained*, or *I have suffered constraint*, and it = *I am obliged*.

There is no great difficulty, then, in the logical part of the questions considered in the present chapter. There is an action which a certain verb expresses, and this action is the effect of a preceding one. Meanwhile, the link that connects the two is so short that, for the purposes of language, the preliminary act and its result are one.

§ 455. But the logical view is not our only one. We must look at the *forms* of the words in question, as well as their meanings. If *shall* be a perfect tense, what

is the present form out of which it originated? Again, how do we know it to be thus perfect? It is only the etymologist who knows anything about it; the common speakers of common English look upon it as a present. And may they not treat it as such? May they not form a perfect tense out of it? Have they not actually done so in some instances? If *dare* be no present but a perfect, what is *dared*? A perfect formed on a perfect.

§ 456. Hence, there are two series of phenomena exhibited by the words under notice. (1.) There is the loss of the original present. (2.) There is the development of secondary forms.

§ 457. It is very evident that the præterites most likely to become present are those of the class which change the vowel. (1.) The fact of their being perfect is less marked. The word *fell* carries with it fewer marks of its tense than the word *moved*. (2.) They can more conveniently give rise to secondary forms. A præterite already ends in *-d* or *-t*. If this be used as a present, a second *-d* or *-t* must be appended.

§ 458. Respecting these præterite-presents, we have to consider—

Firstly—the words themselves;

Secondly—the forms they take as perfect-presents (or present-perfects); and—

Thirdly—the secondary forms derived from them.

If we can do *more* than this, it is well and good. Thus—it is well and good if we can succeed, in arguing back from the existing forms to the ones that are lost, so reconstructing the original true presents. Also, if we can ascertain the original meaning as well, so much the better.

§ 459. *Dare, durst*.—The verb *dare* is both transitive and intransitive. We can say either *I dare do such a thing*, or *I dare (challenge) such a man to do it*. This, in

the present tense, is unequivocally correct. In the perfect the double power of the word *dare* is ambiguous; still it is, to my mind at least, allowable. We can certainly say *I dared him to accept my challenge*; and we can, perhaps, say *I dared not venture on the expedition*. In this last sentence, however, *durst* is the preferable expression. Now, although a case can be made out in favour of *dare* being both transitive and intransitive, *durst* is only intransitive. It never agrees with the Latin word *provoco*, only with the Latin word *audeo*; inasmuch as, whatever may be the propriety or impropriety of such a sentence as *I dared not venture*, &c., it is quite certain that we can not say *I durst him to accept my challenge*. Again—*dare* can be used only in the present tense, *dared* in the perfect only. *Durst* can be used in either. Thus—we can say *I durst not* in the sense *I am afraid to*—and in the sense *I was afraid to*. We can also say, *I durst not do it, although you ask me*; and *I durst not do it when you asked me*. In sense, then, *durst* is both a præterite and a present.

§ 460. In form *dur-st* is peculiar. What is the import of the *-st*? In such an expression as *thou durst not*, it looks like the *-st* in *call-est*; which is the sign of the second person singular. But we can say *I durst* and *he durst*. Hence, if the *-st* in *dur-st* be the *-st* in *call-est*, it is *that and something more*. In all probability the *-s* is part of the original root, of which the fuller and older form was *dars*. If so, the inflection would run—

PRÆSENT.		PERFECT.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. Dars	Durs-on.	1. Durs-te	Durs-ton.
2. Durs-e	Durs-on.	2. Durs-t-est	Durs-ton.
3. Dars	Durs-on.	3. Durs-te	Durs-ton.

That the *-s* is part of the original word is nearly certain. The root in question is one which occurs beyond the pale of the German languages. It is Greek as well

as German ; and in Greek the form is *ῥαπ-εῖν* or *ῥαρ-εῖν* (*tharr-ein*, *thars-ein*), a fact sufficient to account for the presence and the absence of the *-s*. Let *-s-* be lost in the present, and let *a* become *ea*, and we have the actual A. S. forms.

PRESENT.		PERFECT.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. Dear	Durr-on.	1. Durste	Durs-t-on.
2. { Durre † } { Dear-st }	Durr-on.	2. { Durst (for) { Durst-est) }	Durs-t-on.
3. Dear	Durr-on.	3. Durst	Durs-t-on.

The Mæso-Gothic forms are *dar*, *darst* ? *dar*, *daúrur*, *daúrur*, *daúrur*, for the persons of the present tense ; and *daúrsta*, *daúrstét*, *daúrsta*, &c., for those of the præterite. The same is the case throughout the German languages. No *-s*, however, appears in the Scandinavian ; the præterites being *porði* and *törde*, Icelandic and Danish.

§ 461. *Own*, and *owned*, from *own* = *admit*.—In sentences like “ he *owned* to having done it = he *admitted* having done it ; ” or “ I have *owned* to it = I have *conceded*, or *granted* it,” the original and fundamental idea is that of *giving* ; an idea allied to that of *concession* and *admission*. Notion for notion, this has but little to do with the word *own*, as applied to property. Indeed, it is necessary to bear in mind the fact that the two words are distinct. To express this difference, the word before us may be called the *own concedentis* ; the other, the *own possidentis* ;—the *concessive own*, and the *possessive own*. The *own concedentis* is a word of the same class with *dare*, &c. *i. e.* præterite in the garb of a present ; and *owned* is a secondary præterite, or a præterite derived from a præterite.

The A. S. forms are—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. an	unnon.
2. unne	unnon.
3. an	unnon.

Participle, ge-unnen.

Of these A. S. forms, *unne* deserves notice. It gives the form in *e*, not the form in *-st*. It also gives us the change of the vowel; so that the word comes out the true præterite *unne*, instead of the present *an-est* (*own, own-est*). The plural forms are also præterite—*unn-on*, rather than *an-að*. The præterite form is more important still.

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. uðe	uð-on.
2. uðest	uð-on.
3. uðe	uð-on.

But the present word *own-ed* is no modern form of *uðe*, but a separate and independent formation. Hence, its history is as follows:—

(a) A certain present, long ago obsolete, gave as its præterite *an*.

(b) The præterite *an* passed as a present.

(c) The præterite-present gave origin to the secondary præterite *uðe*.

(d) The original præterite-present changed its form, and from *an* or *un* (*unne*) became *own*.

(e) Meanwhile the form *uðe* became obsolete; and—

(f) *Own-ed* became evolved as an ordinary præterite of *own*.

“Ich *an* well” to cwadh the niztegale.—*Hule and Nightingale*, 173.

I take that me God *an*.—*Tristram*, 3. 7.

i. e. I take what God has given me.

§ 462. *Can*.—The form *could* has already been noticed. The remarks upon it having been to the effect that as the *l* was a blunder (and that a blunder of spelling only), we may simplify the investigation by dealing with the word as if it were simply *coud*. The history of the word then comes to be nearly that of the words *an* and *uðe*—nearly, but not quite. The form *can-st* is peculiar, being a truly

present form co-existent in A. S. with the truly præterite form *cunne*.

PRESENT.

1. can
2. cunne and canst
3. can

PRÆTERITE.

1. cuð-e.
2. cuð-est.
3. cuð-e.

Had the history of *can* been *exactly* that of *an*, the præterite would have been *canned*.

I can no more expound in this matere,
I lerne song, I *can* but smal grammere.

CHAUCER, *Prioress's Tale*, v. 83.

He seede *canst* thou Greek.—WIGLIF, *Deedis*, 21.

Lewede men *cunne* French non,
Amongst an hondred unne this on.—*Richard Cœur de Lion*, v. 6.

i. e. Unlearned men understand no French,
Amongst a hundred scarcely one.

His fellow taught him homeward prively
Fro day to day till he *coude* it by rote.—CHAUCER, *Prioress's Tale*, v. 93.

—— while there is a mouthe
For ever his name shall be couthe.—GOWER, *Confessio Amantis*, 6.

I've seen myself, and served against the French,
And they *can* well on horseback.—*Hamlet*, iv. 6.

Macænas and Agrippa who *can** most with Cæsar are his friends.—
Dryden.

Clerkys þat knowen þys schoulde *ken*en hyt abroad.
Vision of Piers Plowman, pass. 2.

Full redles may ye ren
With all your rewful route,
With care men sall yow *ken*
Edward youre Lord to lout.—*Minot*, p. 23.

Full redeless may ye run
With all your ruefu' rout
With care one shall teach you
To obey Edward your Lord.

Sir Edward sale *ken* you youre crede.—*Minot*, p. 34.

* Here *can* most, &c. = *qui, apud Cæsarem plurimum valent*.

§ 463. *Shall* and *should*.—The latter word stands nearly in the same relation to *shall* as *coud* does to *can*, and *uðe* to *an*. In A. S., however, the *u* of the plural of the present was long.

PRESENT.		PRÆTERITE.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. sceal	scul-on.	1. scul-de	scul-d-on
2. { scealt }	scul-on.	2. scul-d-est	scul-d-on
{ sceale }		3. scul-de	scul-d-on
3. sceal	scul-on.		

The form *shalt*, a form which raises a question of person rather than tense, has already been noticed.

§ 464. *Might from may*.—The *-y* in *may* was originally *-g*; so that our inquiries may proceed as if the word before us were *mag*.

PRESENT.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. mag	mag-on.
2. { α. mag-est }	mag-on.
{ β. mag-e }	
3. mag	mag-on.

I am taught to be filled, and to hungre and to abound and to suffre mysciste. I *may* all things in him that comforteth me.—WICLIFFE, *Fil*, 4.

he that most *may* when he syttes in pride
When it comes on assay is kesten down wide.

Townley Mysteries, 84.

The greet dai of his wrath the cometh, and who shall *mowe* (*be able to*) stand.—WICLIF, *Apocalypse* vi.

I seye to you monye seker to entre and ther schuler not *mowe* (*be able*).
WICLIF, *Luke* xiii.

§ 465. *Minded*.—This word is the præterite of *mind*; as, A. *mind your business*; B. *I do mind it, and have minded it all along*. As the præterite of *mind*, there is nothing particular in the word *minded*. But there is a great deal which is particular in the word *mind* itself, wherein the *-d* is no part of the root, but on the con-

trary the sign of the præterite tense; so that *minded* is a præterite formed from a præterite, just like *should*, *owned*, &c., &c. But *minded* has the further peculiarity of being not only a præterite in *-d*, but a præterite in *-d* formed upon a præterite in *-d*. This is the case with none of the previous words. Secondary præterites as they are, their basis was always formed by a change of vowel; in other terms, it was a præterite like *swam* rather than one like *call-ed*. If it were not so, there would be two *d*'s in all the preceding words; just as there are two *d*'s in *min-d-ed*. The A. S. forms are *ge-man*, *ge-manst*, *ge-munon*, along with *ge-munde*, *ge-mundon*. Hence, the form *minded* (*he minded his business*) is a tertiary formation.

1st. There was the form *man* (*mun*) from *min* (?); for all practical purposes a present.

2nd. There was the form *ge-munde*, whence the English present *mind*.

3rd. There is *min-d-ed* from *mind*.

Let us, again, go over the A. S. forms, paying special attention to those in *u*.

PRESENT.		PRÆTERITE.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. <i>ge-man</i>	. <i>ge-mun-on.</i>	1. <i>ge-mun-d-e</i>	<i>ge-mund-on.</i>
2. { <i>ge-man-st</i> }	<i>ge-mun-on.</i>	2. <i>ge-mun-d-est</i>	<i>ge-mun-d-on.</i>
{ <i>ge-mune</i> }		3. <i>ge-mun-d-e</i>	<i>ge-mun-d-on.</i>
3. <i>ge-man</i>	. <i>ge-mun-on</i>		

It is from (*ge*)-*munde* that *mind* has risen. From *mind* has arisen *min-d-ed*.

§ 466. Another form still stands over. In more than one of our provincial dialects we find the word *mun*—as in *I mun go*; at present, this = *I must go*. Originally, however, it must have been *I am minded to go* = *I have made up my mind to go*. It is a truly præterite form. In the Scandinavian tongue it reappears,

with a somewhat different, though allied, power, as *mon* and *monne*.

§ 467. *Wot*.—*Wot* = *knew*. It is the perfect form of *wit*, as in *Middlesex to wit* = *Middlesex to know*, or *to be known*.

§ 468. *Ought*.—In this word the *gh* represents an A. S. *h*; an *h* which grew out of *g*.

PRESENT.		PRÆTERITE.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. áh .	ágon.	1. áh-te .	ah-t-on
2. agest, ahst .	ágon.	2. áh-t-est .	ah-t-on
3. ah .	ágon.	3. áh-te .	ah-t-on
		<i>Infinitive</i> , ág-an.	
		<i>Participle</i> , ág-en.	

In the present English the word *owe* = the A. S. *áh*; whilst *ought* = the A. S. *áhte*. The Latin *debeo* = both words; viz. the A. S. *áh*, and the English *owe*. But it has two senses—*I am under a moral obligation* and *I am a debtor*. But, *owe* is limited to the latter of these senses. In the language of the nineteenth century, at least, we can say *I owe money*; but we cannot say *I owe to pay some*. On the other hand, we cannot say *I ought money*; though we can say *I ought to pay some*. The effect of this twofold sense has been to separate the words *owe* and *ough-t*; by giving to the former the modern præterite *ow-ed*, which no more came from *áhte*, than *owned* came from *uðe*. It has also deprived *ought* of its present form, the equivalent to the A. S. *áh*.

§ 469. As a consequence of this, *ought* has two powers. It is a present and a præterite as well. We can say—

He says that I ought to go; and
He said that I ought to go—

just as we say—

He says that I wish to go; and
He said that I wished to go.

§ 470. *Ought* comes from *owe*—from *ow*- without any sound of *n*.

Own concedentis comes from *o-n*, where there is not only a sound of *n*, but where that sound of *n* is part and parcel of the root.

What does *own* = *possess* come from? Not from the *own concedentis*, though it agrees with that word in having the sound of *n*. (1.) The *-n* of the *own concedentis* is radical. The *-n* of the other *own* is not so. (2.) The *ow* of the *own concedentis* has grown out of *n*. The *w* of the other *own* has grown out of *h*, which has grown out of *g*, *gh*, *k*, or *kh*.

§ 471. Let us now look to the relation between *own* and *owe* (whence *ought*).

1. *Owe* (whence *ought*) has no *n*. Neither had *own* until after the time of Elizabeth.

—Steven þat the land *aught* (*possessed*).

ROBERT OF BOUENE, 126.

The knight, the which that castle *aught*.

Faery Queen, 6. 3. 2.

I *owe* to be baptized of thee, and thou comest to me.

WICLIFF, Matt. iii.

A stern geaunt is he, of him thou *owest* to drede.

Tristram, 3. 39.

See where he comes ; nor poppy nor mandragora,

Nor all the drowsy syrups of the world,

Can ever med'cine thee to that sweet sleep

Which thou *owe'dst* yesterday. — *Othello*.

2. The *w* in the *owe* (whence *ought*) represents an *h* (A. S. *ah*), representing a *g*, or *gh*, *k*, or *kh*. Hence the connection is with *owe* (whence *ought*). Hence, too, the *own debentis* gives an *owe* (or *own*).

§ 472. *Must*.—I can only say of this form that it is common to all persons, numbers, and tenses.

§ 473. The class of words under notice is a *natural* one; one of their characteristics being their great antiquity. This is shown by the large portion of the so-

called Indo-European languages over which they are spread.

1. *C-n* (the root of *can*) = the *γν*, the root of *γν-ώω* *γν-όω*, *gn-ovi* = *know*.

2. *D-rs* (the root of *durs-t*) = the *ῥ-ρς*, the root of *ῥαρσ-έiv* = *dare*.

3. *M-g* (the root of *may*) = (?) the *mac* in *macte*. *Macte* (*proceed, go on*) *tua virtute puer, &c.*

4. *-N-* (the root of *own concedentis*) = (?) the *-n-* in *nuo*, *annuo* (= *nod assent*).

5. *Ow-*, the root of *own possidentis* = *eigan* = *ἐχ-iv* *ἐχ-ω* = *I have*.

6. *W-t*, the root of *wit* and *wot* = the *δ* in *οιδ-α* (*I know* = *I have seen*) and *vid-i*.

7. *M-n* (the root of *mun* and *mind*) = *m-n* in *me mind* = *I have called to mind*.

CHAPTER XXXII.

THE VERB SUBSTANTIVE.

§ 474. THE so-called Verb Substantive gives us Defect, and Complement; but no Irregularity.

Was.—Found both in the indicative and conjunctive.

INDICATIVE.		CONJUNCTIVE.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. Was.	Were.	1. Were.	Were.
2. Wast.	Were.	2. Wert.	Were.
3. Was.	Were.	3. Were.	Were.

Be.—In the present English conjugated thus:—

CONJUNCTIVE.		IMPERATIVE.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Be.	Be.	—	—
—	Be.	Be.	Be.
Be.	Be.	—	—
<i>Infñ.</i> To be.	<i>Pres. P.</i> Being.	<i>Past Part.</i> Been.	

§ 475. In the *Deutsche Grammatik* it is stated that the Anglo-Saxon forms *beo*, *bist*, *bið*, *beoð*, or *beo*, have not a present, but a future sense; that whilst *am* means *I am*, *beo* means *I shall be*; and that in the older languages it is only where the form *am* is not found that *be* has the power of a present form. The same root occurs in the Slavonic and Lithuanic tongues with the same power; as, *esmi* = *I am*; *búsu* = *I shall be*, Lithuanic.—*Esmu* = *I am*; *buhshu* = *I shall be*, Livonian.—*Jesm* = *I am*; *budu* = *I shall be*, Slavonic.—*Gsem* = *I am*; *budu* = *I shall be*, Bohemian. This, however, proves, not that there is in Anglo-Saxon a future tense (or form), but that the word *beo* has a future sense. There is no fresh tense where there is no fresh form.

§ 476. This is explained if we consider the word *beon* to mean not so much *to be* as *to become*, a view which gives us an element of the idea of futurity. Things which are *becoming anything* have yet something further to do. Again, from the idea of futurity we get the idea of contingency, and this explains the subjunctive power of *be*—*Hi ne beoð na cilde, soðlice, on domesdæge, ac beoð swa micle menn swa swa hi migton beon gif hi full weoxon on gewunlicre ylde* = *They will not be children, forsooth, on Domesday, but will be as much (so muckle) men as they might be if they were all grown (waxen) in customary age.*—ÆLFRIC's *Homilies*.

§ 477. *Am*.—The letter *-m* is no part of the original word. It is the sign of the first person, just as it is in all the Indo-European languages. It should also be stated, that, although the fact be obscured, and although the changes be insufficiently accounted for, the forms *am*, *art*, *are*, and *is*, are not, like *am* and *was*, parts of different words, but forms of one and the same word; in other terms, that, although between *am* and *be* there is no etymological connection, there is one between *am* and *is*.

VERB-SUBSTANTIVES.

This we collect from the comparison of the other allied languages.

Sanakrit . . .	<i>asmi</i>	<i>asi.</i>	<i>asti.</i>
Zend . . .	<i>ahm.</i>	<i>asi.</i>	<i>ashti.</i>
Greek . . .	<i>si.</i>	<i>si.</i>	<i>si.</i>
Latin . . .	<i>sum.</i>	<i>es.</i>	<i>est.</i>
Lithuanic . .	<i>esmi.</i>	<i>essi.</i>	<i>esti.</i>
Old Slavonic .	<i>ysmy.</i>	<i>yesi.</i>	<i>yesty.</i>
Mæso-Gothic .	<i>im.</i>	<i>is.</i>	<i>ist.</i>
Icelandic . .	<i>em.</i>	<i>ert.</i>	<i>er.</i>

§ 478. *Worth*.—This is a verb of which the present English gives us but a fragment. In the following extract it means *betide*.

Woe *worth* the chase, woe *worth* the day,
That cost thy life my gallant grey.—*Lady of the Lake*.

The A.-S. infinitive was *weorðan* = *werden* in H. G.
= *become*.

Grote watres *worþeþ* yet rede of monnes blode,
Cristendom *worþ* y-cast and a doun.*

ROBERT OF GLOUCESTER, 132.

And so it fell upon a dai
Forsoth as I you tellen mai,
Sir Thopas wold out ride,
He *worth* upon his stede grey.—CHAUCER.

Backe hem noht but let him *worþe*.

Vision of Piers Plowman.

My ioie is tourned into strife
That sober shall I never *worthe*.—GOWER, *Conf. Am.* 5.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE PARTICIPLES.—THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

§ 479. THE present participle is formed by adding *-ing*, as, *move*, *moving*. Like the Latin participle in *-ns*, it was originally declined; the Mæso-Gothic and Old High-German forms being *habands* and *hapēntēr*, respectively. In

* Great waters will be yet red of men's blood,
Christendom will be cast down.

the Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon the forms are *-and* and *ande*; as *bindand*, *bindande*, = *binding*. In all the Norse languages, ancient and modern, the *-d* is preserved. So it is in the Old Lowland Scotch, and in many of the modern provincial dialects of England, where *strikind*, *goand*, is said for *striking*, *going*. In Staffordshire, where the *-ing* is pronounced *-ingg*, there is a fuller sound than that of the current English. In Old English the form in *-nd* is predominant, in Middle English the use fluctuates, and in New English the termination *-ing* is universal. In the Scotch of the modern writers we find the form *-in*.

The rising sun o'er Galston muirs
Wi' glorious light was glintin';
The hares were hirplin' down the furs,
The lav'rocks they were chantin'.

BURNS' *Holy Fair*.

In A. S., as has been already stated, the Participle was declined.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

THE PAST PARTICIPLE.—FORM IN *-EN*.

§ 480. *THE participle in -en*.—In Anglo-Saxon it always ended in *-en* as *sungcn*, *funden*, *bunden*. In English it does so occasionally. We say, however, *bound* and *found*, the word *bounden* being antiquated. Words where the *-en* is wanting may be viewed in two lights: 1, they may be looked upon as participles that have lost their termination; 2, they may be considered as præterites with a participial sense.

§ 481. *Drank*, *drunk*, *drunken*.—When the vowel of the plural differs from that of the singular, the participle takes the plural form. To say *I have drunk*, is to use an ambiguous expression; since *drunk* may be either a parti-

ciple *minus* its termination, or a præterite with a participial sense. To say *I have drank*, is to use a præterite for a participle. To say *I have drunken*, is to use an unexceptionable form.

§ 482. In all words with a double form, as *spake* and *spoke*, *break* and *broke*, *clave* and *clove*, the participle follows the form in *o*—*spoken*, *broken*, *cloven*. *Spaken*, *braken*, *claven*, are impossible forms. There are degrees of laxity in language, and to say *the spear is broke* is better than to say *the spear is brake*. These two statements bear upon the future history of the præterite. That of the two forms *sang* and *sung*, one will, in the course of language, become obsolete, is nearly certain; and, as the plural form is also that of the participle, it is the plural form which is most likely to be the surviving one.

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præterite.</i>	<i>Participle.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præterite.</i>	<i>Participle.</i>
Fall	Fell	Fallen	Shear	Shore	Shorn
Hold	Held	Holden	Wear	Wore	Worn
Draw	Drew	Drawn	Break	Broke	Broken
Shew	Shewed	Shewn	Shake	Shook	Shaken
Slay	Slew	Slain	Take	Took	Taken
Fly	Flew	Flown	Get	Got	Gotten
Blow	Blew	Blown	Eat	Ate	Eaten
Crow	Crew	Crown	Tread	Trod	Trodden
Know	Knew	Known	Bid	Bade	Bidden
Grow	Grew	Grown	Forbid	Forbade	Forbidden
Throw	Threw	Thrown	Give	Gave	Given
Beat	Beat	Beaten	Arise	Arose	Arisen
Weave	Wove	Woven	Smite	Smote	Smitten
Freeze	Froze	Frozen	Ride	Rode	Ridden
Steal	Stole	Stolen	Stride	Strode	Stridden
Speak	Spoke	Spoken	Drive	Drove	Driven
Swear	Swore	Sworn	Thrive	Throve	Thriven
Bear	Bore	Borne	Strive	Strove	Striven
Bear	Bare	Born	Write	Wrote	Written
Tear	Tore	Torn	Bite	Bit	Bitten

§ 483. *Sodden* from *seethe*.—The *d* is Anglo-Saxon. It was found in three other words besides.

<i>Præterite.</i>		<i>Participle.</i>
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plural</i>	
1. cwæð	cwædon	<i>ge-cwæðen</i>
2. cwæde	cwædon	
3. cwæð	cwædon	
1. snað	snidon	<i>ge-sniden</i>
2. (¹)	snidon	
3. cnað	snidon	
1. seað	sudon	<i>ge-soden</i>
2. sude	sudon	
3. seað	sudon	
1. wearð	wurdon	<i>ge-worden</i>
2. wurde	wurdon	
3. wearð	wurdon	

§ 484. *Forlorn*.—In the Latin language the change from *s* to *r*, and *vice versa*, is very common. We have the double forms *arbor* and *arbos*, *honor* and *honos*, &c. Of this change we have a few specimens in English, *e. g.* *rear* and *raise*. In Anglo-Saxon a few words undergo a similar change in the plural number of the so-called strong præterites.

Ceáse, *I choose*; ceás, *I chose*; curon, *we chose*; gecoren, *chosen*.

Forleáse, *I lose*; forleás, *I lost*; forluron, *we lost*; forloren, *lost*.

Hreose, *I rush*; hreás, *I rushed*; hrunon, *we rushed*; gehroren, *rushed*.

This accounts for the participial form *forlorn* or *lost*, in New High-German *verloren*. In Milton's lines,

— the piercing air

Burns *frore*, and cold performs the effect of fire.

Paradise Lost, b. ii.

we have a form from the Anglo-Saxon participle *gefroren* = *frozen*.

CHAPTER XXXV.

PAST PARTICIPLE.—FORM -ED, -D, OR -T.

§ 485. *THE participle in -d, -t, or -ed.*—In the Anglo-Saxon this participle differed from the præterite, inasmuch as it ended in *-ed* or *-t*; whereas the præterite ended in *-ode*, *-de*, or *-te*—as *lufode*, *bærnde*, *dypte*, præterites; *gelufod*, *bærned*, *dypt*, participles. As the ejection of the *e* reduces words like *bærned* and *bærnde* to the same form, it is easy to account for the present identity of form between the weak præterites and the participles in *-d*: *e.g.* *I moved, I have moved, &c.* The original difference, however, should be remembered.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

PARTICIPLES.—THE PREFIX GE-.

§ 486. IN the older writers, and in works written, like Thomson's *Castle of Indolence*, in imitation of them, we find prefixed to the præterite participle the letter *y*-, as *yclept* = *called*; *yclad* = *clothed*; *ydrad* = *dreaded*.

The following are the chief facts and the current opinion concerning this prefix:—

1. It has grown out of the fuller forms *ge*-: Anglo-Saxon *ge*-: Old Saxon, *gi*-: Mæso-Gothic, *ga*-: Old High-German, *ka*-, *cha*-, *ga*-, *ki*-, *gi*-.

2. It occurs in each and all of the *Teutonic*;

3. It occurs, with a few fragmentary exceptions, in none of the *Scandinavian*, languages.

4. In Anglo-Saxon, it occasionally indicates a difference of sense; as *hâten* = *called*, *ge-hâten* = *promised*; *boren* = *borne*, *ge-boren* = *born*.

5. It occurs in nouns as well as verbs.

6. Its power, in the case of nouns, is generally some idea of *association* or *collection*.—Mæso-Gothic, *sinþs* = *a journey*, *ga-sinþa* = *a companion*; Old High-German, *perc* = *hill*; *ki-perki* (*ge-birge*) = *a range of hills*.

7. But it has also a *frequentative* power; a frequentative power which is, in all probability, secondary to its collective power; since things which recur frequently recur with a tendency to collection or association. In Middle High-German, *ge-rassel* = *rustling*; *ge-rumpel* = *c-rumple*.

8. And it has also the power of expressing the possession of a quality.

<i>Anglo-Saxon.</i>	<i>English.</i>	<i>Anglo-Saxon.</i>	<i>Latin.</i>
feax	hair	ge-feax	comatus
heorte	heart	ge-hcort	cordatus
stence	odour	ge-stence	odorus.

In the latest parts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (which ends with the reign of Stephen) we find, *inter alia*, the absence of this prefix in all participles except one; that one being *ge-haten*;—a word which, in the Northumbrian dialect, was the last to lose its characteristic initial. Word for word, *ge-haten* = *hight* = *called*. Sense for sense, it = *y-clept*, which also means *called*: a word which is not yet quite obsolete.

PART V.

SYNTAX.

CHAPTER I.

ON SYNTAX IN GENERAL.

§ 487. THE word *Syntax* is derived from the Greek *syn* = *with*, or *together*, and *taxis* = *arrangement*. It treats of the arrangement of words, and the principles upon which they are put together so as to form sentences. It deals with groups or combinations; in this respect differing from Etymology, which deals with individual words only. *Composition* belongs as much to Syntax as to Etymology; for it has already been stated that it is not always an easy matter to distinguish between two separate words and a compound. A crow is *a black bird*. It is not, however, *a black-bird*. The criterion is the accent. When the two words are equally accented, the result is a pair of separate words, connected with one another, according to the rules of Syntax; as *the crow is a bláck bird*. When the two words are *unequally* accented, the result is a Compound; as *the bláck-bird is akin to the thrush*.

§ 488. *Construction* and *Syntax* have much the same meaning. We speak of the rules of *Syntax*, and of the

Construction of sentences. The Syntax of a language is always regulated by its Etymology; so that in those languages where the signs of Gender, Number, Case, Person, Tense, and Mood are numerous, the Syntax is complex. On the other hand, where the Etymology is simple the Syntax is of moderate dimensions.

§ 489. In Etymology we *Decline* and *Conjugate*; in Syntax we *Parse*. Parsing is of two kinds; Logical and Etymological. Logical Parsing gives the analysis of sentences according to their Terms and Copulas, telling us which is the Subject and which the Predicate, which the chief, and which the secondary, parts of each. Etymological Parsing gives the analysis of sentences according to the Parts of Speech of which they are composed. It tells us which is the Noun, and which the Verb, &c. It separates Adjectives from Substantives, Pronouns from Adverbs, and the like. It deals with Numbers, Cases, Persons, &c.

§ 490. Speech chiefly consists of (1) commands, (2) questions, and (3) statements. The combination of words by which these are effected is called a Proposition. There are three kinds of Propositions; one to express commands, one to express questions, and one to express statements.

Propositions which convey commands are called Imperative, as *do this, do not delay, walk*.

Propositions which convey questions are called Interrogative, as—*what is this? who are you? Is it here?*

Propositions which convey statements are called Declaratory,—as *summer is coming, I am here, this is he*.

Sentences like *may you be happy* are called Optative, from the Latin word *opto* = *I wish*. By more than one good authority, they are placed in a class by themselves as a fourth species of proposition. And it cannot be denied that they are expressions of a peculiar character.

Would I could is also optative, meaning *I wish I could*, or more fully,

*I wish
that
I could.*

Such being the case, we have two propositions conveyed by three words. There is the omission of the conjunction *that*; and (more remarkable) that of the personal pronoun as well.

Sentences like *how well you look* convey an exclamation of surprise, and have been called Exclamatory. Optative Propositions are, to a certain extent, Imperative, and, to a certain extent, Declaratory. In *may you be happy*, change the place of *may* and *you*, and the result is an ordinary assertion, *you may be happy*. On the other hand, *you be happy*, is a command. There is no command, however, without a real or supposed wish on the part of the speaker.

Exclamatory Propositions are, to a certain extent, Interrogative, and to a certain extent, Declaratory. In *how well you look*, change the place of the essential parts, and the result is an ordinary assertion, *you look well*. Meanwhile, *how* indicates the degree or extent of your well-looking. But it only *indicates* it. The degree itself is undefined; and (as such) the possible object of a question. *How do you look?* is an actual Interrogation.

Besides being Imperative, Interrogative or Declaratory, Propositions are either Affirmative or Negative.—*Summer is early—summer is not early.*

§ 491. In respect to their structure Propositions consist of Terms and Copulas.

Terms are of two kinds, Subjects and Predicates.

The Subject is the term by which we indicate the person or thing concerning which the statement is made or the question asked. In Imperative Propositions it denotes

the person to whom the command is given. Thus:—*Summer is coming—what is this—make [thou] haste.*

The Predicate is the term by which we express what we declare, ask, or command. There is no Subject without its corresponding Predicate; no Predicate without its corresponding Subject; and without both a Subject and Predicate there is no such thing as a Proposition. Without Propositions there are no Questions, Commands, or Declarations; and without these, there would scarcely be such a thing as Language. The little which there would be would consist merely of exclamations like *Oh! Ah! Pish, &c.*

§ 492. The simplest sentences are those which consist of single simple propositions; as

The sun is shining.
The moon is shining.
The sun is red.
The sun is bright.

Sentences like

The sun and moon are shining;
The sun and moon are shining bright,

are anything but simple; for although, when we consider them merely as sentences, they are both short and clear, they each consist of *two* propositions, as will be stated again.

§ 493. The simplest propositions are those that consist of the simplest terms; as

Fire is burning,
Summer is coming,
Man is mortal,
I am glad,

and the like; wherein the number of words is three—three and no more; one for the Subject, one for the Predicate, and one for the Copula.

§ 494. The shortest propositions are not always the simplest. When each word represents either a term or a copula, their grammatical elements coincide accurately

with their logical, as was the case with the preceding examples. When, however, these contain fewer than three words, it is clear that either something must be supplied or that a term and copula are combined in the same word; as is the case with such expressions as

Fire burns,
Summer comes,

where *comes* and *burns* are both Predicate and Copula at once.

§ 495. The simplest propositions, then, are those that consist of what are called *single-worded* terms. Most terms, however, are *many-worded*. If it were not so, what would become of those words which, though incapable by themselves of forming a name, are still used for forming a *part* of one—words like *the*, *of* and the like? Very simple propositions can easily be converted into their opposite; as may be seen by the following operations upon the words

Fire is burning.

1. Prefix the definite article.—*The fire.*
2. Insert an adjective.—*The bright fire.*
3. Add an adverb.—*The very bright fire.*
4. Add a participle, and convert *bright* into its corresponding adverb.—*The very brightly-burning fire.*
5. Introduce a second substantive, showing its relations to the word *fire* by means of a preposition.—*The very brightly-burning fire of wood.*
6. Insert *which* after *fire*, followed by a secondary proposition.—*The very brightly-burning fire which was made this morning of wood.*
7. Add another secondary proposition relating to *wood*.—*The very brightly-burning fire which was made this morning out of the wood which was brought from the country.*
8. Add another secondary proposition by means of a conjunction.—*The very brightly-burning fire which was made this morning out of the wood which was brought from the country, because there was a sale.*

It is clear that processes like this may be carried on *ad infinitum*, so that a sentence of any amount of complexity will be the result. Meanwhile, the Predicate may be

made as many-worded as the Subject. Notwithstanding all this, the primary and fundamental portion of the term is manifestly the word *fire*. To this all the others are subordinate. In like manner, the following lines from the opening of the *Paradise Lost*, give us but a single term, of which the word *fruit* is the fundamental element.

The *fruit*

Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
With loss of Eden ; till one greater Man
Restore us, and regain the blissful seat, &c.

§ 496. The Part of Speech to which a word belongs is determined by the place that it takes in the structure of a Proposition. For instance,—words that can by themselves constitute terms are either Nouns or Pronouns ; words that can constitute *both* predicates and copulas, Verbs ; words which can constitute but parts, or fractions of terms, Adverbs, Prepositions ; and the like.

§ 497. In Declaratory Propositions the Subject precedes the Predicate. We say *Fire is hot*, rather than *Hot is fire*.

§ 498. In Interrogative Propositions the Predicate precedes the subject ; as *What is this ?* rather than *This is what ?*

§ 499. In Imperative Propositions the name of the Subject is usually suppressed ; *e. g.* we say, *shut the door*, instead of *shut thou the door*.

§ 500. Names are either Proper or Common. Proper names are appropriated to certain individual objects. Common names are applied to a whole class of objects. *George, Mary, London, &c.*, designate one particular person or place. *Man, father, town, horse, &c.*, represent objects of which there is a class or collection.

§ 501. Besides being either Proper or Common, names are either Invariable or Variable.

§ 502. The two most important terms in Syntax are

Concord and Regimen ; the first of which means Agreement, the latter Government. When the Gender, Number, Case, or Person of two connected words is the *same*, we have a Concord, and one word *agrees with* another. There is also a Concord of Mood and Tense ; though of this little notice is taken. It is clear, however, that when we say *I do this that I may gain by it*, we preserve a Concord ; and that in saying, either, *I do this that I might gain by it*, or, *I did this that I may gain by it*, we break one.

§ 503. *Apposition*.—*Cæsar, the Roman emperor, invades Britain*.—Here the words *Roman emperor* explain, or define, the word *Cæsar* ; and the sentence, filled up, might stand, *Cæsar, that is, the Roman emperor, &c.* Again, the words *Roman emperor*, might be wholly ejected ; or, if not ejected, they might be thrown into a parenthesis. The practical bearing of this fact is exhibited by changing the form of the sentence, and inserting the conjunction *and*. In this case, instead of one person, two are spoken of, and the verb *invades* must be changed from the singular to the plural. Now the words *Roman emperor* are said to be in apposition to *Cæsar*. They constitute, not an additional idea, but an explanation of the original one. They are, as it were, *laid alongside (appositi) of* the word *Cæsar*. Cases of doubtful number, wherein two substantives precede a verb, and wherein it is uncertain whether the verb should be singular or plural, are decided by determining whether the substantives be in apposition or the contrary. No matter how many nouns there may be, so long as it can be shown that they are in apposition, the verb is in the singular number, provided that the main noun is also singular.

§ 504. In expressions like *the king of Saxony's army*, we state, not that the army belongs to *Saxony*, but that

it belongs to *the-king-of-Saxony* ; the whole phrase being dealt with as a single word in the possessive case.

§ 505. A little consideration will teach that, in most cases, the laws of Syntax are neither more nor less than the dictates of common sense applied to language, and that, in many cases, the ordinary rules are superfluous. This applies most especially to the Concords, or Agreements. No one, who speaks English, need be told that in speaking of a man we say *he* ; a woman, *she* ; an inanimate object, *it*. In doing this, we suit the Pronoun to the Substantive, and use a masculine, a feminine, or a neuter form accordingly. Consequently, the words are said to agree with one another. It would, however, be strange if they did not. The word *man* is the name of a male. The pronoun *he* is the same. They are applied to the same object. Again,—if certain pronouns, such as *they*, apply only to a number of individuals, and never to a single person, and if such a verb as *calls* applies to a single individual only, and never to a number, it requires no great amount of ingenuity to discover that such an expression as *they calls* is nonsensical. *They* denotes a multitude ; *calls* a single individual. How can the two be united ? It is, of course, useful to know that the first of these instances gives what the grammarians call a Concord of gender ; the second a Concord of Number. Common sense, however, lies at the bottom of both. A Substantive and a Pronoun which each denote an object of the same sex cannot fail to be in the same Gender ; and, because they are this, they are said to agree with one another. In like manner a Pronoun and a Verb, when each means the same person or the same number of persons, exhibit the Concords of Person and Number. The Concord of Case is somewhat less simple ; neither are the phenomena of Regimen, or Government, on the

whole, so clear as those of Concord. Enough, however, has been said to direct attention and to stimulate curiosity.

§ 506. Though Syntax is, in the main, neither more nor less than common sense, there are certain facts of language which always suffice to render a special study of its rules a matter of necessity. A few of them will be noticed.

Sometimes we have *Collectives*. In these the form is Singular, but the sense is Plural. An *army*, for instance, consists of a number of soldiers, and the act of an army is, in some sense, the act of numerous individuals rather than that of one collective body. The same applies to words like *parliament*, *family*, *people*, *mob*, *set*, *gang*, &c. Hence, even good writers have uttered such expressions as *the multitude pursue pleasure*. No doubt such expressions are justifiable. It is, perhaps, better to write thus than to say *the multitude pursues*, &c. At the same time it would be wrong to say *the meeting were large*. As all Collectives give at once the ideas of *unity* and of *plurality*, consider, when you doubt about using the *singular* or the *plural* form of the Verb, which of the two ideas you wish to bring into prominence.

I have not travelled these twenty years.—Here we do not think of twenty years taken separately, but of *a single period*. The sense is singular, and we use the singular pronoun *this*.

These sort of people.—Here the word *sort* implies the existence of more persons than one, and therefore is taken as plural in sense.

§ 507. Sometimes the etymology is doubtful. The letter *-s* is the sign of the plural number. But certain singulars end in *-s* also. It is clear that those may be mistaken for plural. So high an authority as Pope writes—

Riches, like insects, when concealed *they lie*,
Wait but for wings, and in *their* season fly.

Riches, however, which is neither more nor less than the French *richesse*, is a singular form. In like manner, *alms* is from the Anglo-Saxon *ælmesse*, wherein the *-s* is part of the original word, and no sign of number at all.

§ 508. As the habit of treating collectives as plurals interferes with the concord of number, the practice of personification traverses the rules for the concord of gender. We personify an object when we speak of inanimate things as if they were persons.

Gold, whose touch seductive leads to crime.
Death reaps his harvest.
Vice is the parent of misery.
The cities who aspire to liberty.

§ 509. *Ellipsis* (from the Greek *elleipein* = *to fall short*), or *falling short*, occurs in sentences like *I sent to the bookseller's*. Here *shop* or *house* is understood. Expressions like *to go on all fours*, and *to eat of the fruit of the tree*, are reducible to ellipses.

§ 510. *Pleonasm* (from the Greek *pleonazein* = *to be in excess*) occurs in expressions like *the king, he reigns*. In many *pleonastic* expressions we may suppose an interruption of the sentence, and afterwards an abrupt renewal of it; as *the king—he reigns*; *my banks—they are furnished*.

§ 511. *Zeugma*.—*They wear a dress like that of the Scythians, but a language peculiar to themselves*.—The verb, naturally applying to *dress* only, is here used to govern *language*. This is called, in Greek, *zeugma* (*junction*).

§ 512. *My paternal home was made desolate, and he himself was sacrificed*.—The sense of this is plain; he means *my father*. Yet no such substantive as *father* has gone before. It is supplied, however, from the word *pa-*

ternal. In other words, *he* is understood, according to what is indicated, rather than according to what is expressed. This figure, in Greek, is called *pros to semainomenon* (*according to the thing indicated*).

All this, however, belongs to Rhetoric rather than to strict Syntax.

§ 513. In English, as has been seen, our Etymological forms are few. There were, for instance, but few Cases, and there was but little distinction of Gender. The Adjective was remarkably wanting in forms: yet it is a part of speech which, in many languages, has, at least, two Genders—often three. In French, for instance; we say *le bon père* = *the good father*; but *la bonne mère* = *the good mother*; in Latin, *bonus pater* = good father; *bona mater* = good mother; *bonum telum* = good weapon. Meanwhile, the Plural runs *boni patres*, *bonæ matres*, *bona tela*. The Frenchman who said *bon mère* or *bonne père* might be accused of making a false Concord; inasmuch as he would join an Adjective in one Gender to a Substantive in another. No Englishman can possibly commit an error of this kind; because, in the word *good* there is no change at all, and, because, in English we say *good father*, *good mother*, *good thing*, *good fathers*, *good mothers*, *good things* indifferently. The same applies to the Articles. In French there are the forms *un* and *une* = *a* (or *an*); along with *le*, *la*, *les*, meaning *the*. Meanwhile, the German says *der*, *die*, *das*, and *einer*, *eine*, *eines*, where the Englishman says simply *the*, and *a* (or *an*). Of course, then, the rules for the Syntax of the Articles must be simpler in English than in German.

§ 514. *Convertibility*.—On the other hand, English Syntax has certain decided peculiarities. In languages where each part of speech has its own peculiar and characteristic termination it is scarcely possible to confound a Substantive with a Verb or a Verb with a Substantive.

In English, however, where these distinctive signs are rare, it is by no means easy, in all cases, to separate them. Take, for instance, the word *black*. It is, doubtless, in its origin, adjectival. As such, we can give it the degrees of comparison, and say (for instance) *this ink is black, this is blacker, and that is the blackest of all*. But what when we use such an expression as the *blacks of Africa* or the *blacks are falling*, where there is the sign of the plural number, a phenomenon wholly unknown to the English Adjective? Surely, we must say that *black* means *black man*, or *black thing*, and that the word is no longer an Adjective but a Substantive. But this is not all. The word may be used as a Verb and a Participle, and the man who has *had his shoes blacked* may say that *the little boy at the corner of the street blacked them*. Speaking roughly, we may say that in the English language, the greater part of the words may, as far as their form is concerned, be one part of speech as well as another. Thus the combinations *s-a-n-th*, or *f-r-a-n-k*, if they existed at all, might exist as either nouns or verbs, as either substantives or adjectives, as conjunctions, adverbs, or prepositions. This is not the case with the Greek language. There, if a word be a substantive, it will probably end in *-s*, if an infinitive verb, in *-ein*, &c. The bearings of this difference between languages like the English and languages like the Greek will soon appear. At present, it is sufficient to say that a word, originally one part of speech (*e. g.* a noun), may become another (*e. g.* a verb). This may be called the convertibility of words.

(1.) *Adjectives used as substantives*.—Of these, we have examples in expressions like the *blacks of Africa—the bitters and sweets of life—all fours were put to the ground*; which are true instances of conversion, and are proved to be so by the fact of their taking a plural form.

On the other hand, however, *let the blind lead the blind* is *not* an instance of conversion. The word *blind* in both instances remains an adjective, and is shown to remain so by its being uninflected.

(2.) *Particles used as substantives.* — When King Richard says none of your *ifs* he uses the word *if* as a substantive = *expression of doubt*. Again — *one long now* = *one long present time*.

§ 515. Some sentences consist of a single proposition, as—*the sun shines*; others, of two propositions combined, as—*the sun shines, therefore, the day will be fine*. This is made plainer by writing the words thus:

The sun shines,
therefore,
The day will be fine.

The Syntax of Single Propositions, being the simplest, comes first under notice.

CHAPTER II.

SYNTAX OF THE PRONOUN—*THIS, THAT*.

§ 516. A PRONOUN is a variable name which can, by itself, form either the subject or the predicate of a proposition: as *I am he, that is it*. With words like *who, what, this, these, that, those, I, thou, we*, and the like, this power, on the part of the pronoun, is plain and clear. All such words comport themselves as substantives; from which they differ, not in respect to the place which they can take in a proposition, but in respect to the principle upon which they do so. The substantive is a fixed, permanent, and inconvertible name: the pronoun, on

the other hand, is convertible or variable. But the aforesaid words which so decidedly share the nature of substantives, are not the only pronouns. There are, besides, such words as *some, any, many*, of which the character is adjectival rather than substantival. Still, they can form terms; and that by themselves. At the same time they are often accompanied by a substantive, and, in some cases, almost require one. In expressions like *some are here, any will do, many are called, &c.*, the substantive, to which they are the equivalent, can generally be inserted with advantage; so that we may say, *some men, any instrument, many individuals*. All the pronouns of this class are undeclined. The nearest approaches to an exception to the foregoing statement are supplied by the word *same*, and the ordinals; which, instead of standing *quite* alone, are generally preceded by the definite article, so that we say *the same, the first, &c.* Here, however, the article is to be looked on as part of the pronoun. For a further elucidation of this, as well as for the nature of the article itself, see below. The etymology of the pronoun preceded that of the substantive, on account of the pronominal inflection being the fuller. For the same reason, the syntax of the pronoun comes first. That, however, of the relatives and interrogatives finds no place for the present. It belongs to the syntax of compound propositions. That of the demonstratives, *so long as they keep their original demonstrative power*, is simple, being limited to *this, these, that, those*, and *yon*. The simple demonstrative power, however, often passes into something else: a fact which gives us the syntax of the pronoun of the third person, along with that of the indeterminate pronoun, and that of the definite article; all of which will be illustrated as we proceed. In *origin*, however, all these are demonstratives.

§ 517. *This and that*.—The chief point of syntax con-

nected with the pure demonstrative is one that is suggested by the following well-known quotation :—

Quocunque aspicias nihil est nisi pontus et aer;
Nubibus hic tumidus, fluctibus ille minax.

Here *hic* (= *this* or *the one*) refers to the antecedent last named (the *air*); whilst *ille* (= *that* or *the other*) refers to the antecedent *first* named (the *sea*). On the strength of this example, combined with others, it is laid down as a rule in Latin that *this* refers to the last, and *that* to the first, antecedent. What is the rule in English? Suppose we say *John's is a good sword and so is Charles's; this cut through a thick rope, that cut through an iron rod*. In determining to which of the two swords the respective demonstratives refer, the meaning will not help us at all, so that our only recourse is to the rules of grammar; and it is the opinion of the present writer that the rules of grammar will help us just as little. The Latin rule is adopted by scholars, but still it is a Latin rule rather than an English one. It is, probably, a question which no authority can settle; and all that grammar can tell us is, that *this* refers to the name of the idea which is logically the most close at hand, and *that* to the idea which is logically the most distant. What constitutes nearness or distance of ideas—in other words, what determines their sequence—is another question.

CHAPTER III.

SYNTAX OF THE PRONOUN.—*YOU*.—*I*.—*HIS* AND *HER*.—*ITS*.

§ 518. *You*.—As far as the practice of the present mode of speech is concerned, the word *you* is a *nominative* form; since we say *you move, you are moving, you were speaking*. Why should it not be treated as such?

There is no absolute reason why it should not. The Anglo-Saxon form for *you* was *eow*; for *ye*, *gi*. Neither word bears any sign of case at all, so that, form for form, they are equally and indifferently nominative and accusative, as the habit of language may make them. Hence it, perhaps, is more logical to say that a certain form (*you*) is used *either* as a nominative or accusative, than to say that the accusative case is used instead of a nominative; for it is clear that *you* can be used instead of *ye* only so far as it is nominative in power.

§ 519. Dr. Guest has remarked that at one time the two forms were nearly changing place; in evidence of which he gives the following examples:—

As I have made *ye* one, lords, one remain;
So I go stronger *you* more honour gain.

Henry VIII. iv. 2.

What gain *you* by forbidding it to teaze *ye*,
It now can neither trouble you nor please *ye*.—DRYDEN.

§ 520. *Me*.—Carrying out the views just laid down, and admitting *you* to be a nominative, or *quasi*-nominative case, we may extend the reasoning to the word *me*, and call it a secondary nominative; inasmuch as such phrases as *it is me* = *it is I*, are common. To call such expressions incorrect English is to assume the point. No one says that *c'est moi* is bad French and that *c'est je* is good. The fact is, that, with us, the whole question is a question of degree. Has or has not the custom been sufficiently prevalent to have transferred the forms *me*, *ye*, and *you* from one case to another? Or, perhaps, we may say, is there any real custom at all in favour of *I* except so far as the grammarians have made one? It is clear that the French analogy is against it. It is also clear that the personal pronoun as a Predicate may be in a different category from the personal pronoun as a Subject. See § 533.

§ 521. At the same time it must be observed that the expression *it is me* = *it is I* will not justify the use of *it is him, it is her* = *it is he* and *it is she*. *Me, ye, you*, are what may be called *indifferent* forms, i. e. nominative as much as accusative, and accusative as much as nominative. *Him and her*, on the other hand, are not indifferent. The *-m* and *-r* are respectively the signs of cases other than the nominative.

§ 522. *Pronomen reverentia*.—When we say *you* instead of *thou*, it is doubtful whether, in strict language, this is a point of grammar. I imagine that instead of addressing the person we speak to as a single individual, and applying to him a plural pronoun, we treat him as a collection of persons. If so, the practice is other than grammatical. We treat one person as more than one. There is, evidently, some courtesy in this; inasmuch as the practice is very general. The Germans change, not only the number, but the person, and say (e. g.) *sprechen sie Deutsch* = *speak they German?* rather than either *sprichst du* (*speakest thou*), or *sprechet Ihr* (*speak ye*).

§ 523. *Dativus ethicus*.—In the phrase

Rob me the exchequer.—*Henry IV.*

the *me* is expletive, and is equivalent to *for me*. This is conveniently called the *dativus ethicus*. It occurs more frequently in the Latin than in the English, and more frequently in the Greek than in the Latin.

§ 524. *The reflected personal pronoun*.—In the English language there is no equivalent to the Latin *se*, the German *sich*, and the Scandinavian *sik*, or *sig*; from which it follows that the word *self* is used to a greater extent than would otherwise be the case. *I strike me* is awkward, but not ambiguous. *Thou striketh thee* is awkward, but not ambiguous. *He strikes him* is ambiguous; inasmuch as *him* may mean either the *person who strikes*

or some one else. In order to be clear we add the word *self* when the idea is reflective. *He strikes himself* is, at once, idiomatic, and unequivocal. So it is with the plural persons. *We strike us* is awkward, but not ambiguous. *Ye strike you* is the same. *They strike them* is ambiguous. Hence, as a general rule, whenever we use a verb reflectively, we use the word *self* also. The exceptions to this rule are either poetical expressions or imperative moods.

He sat *him* down at a pillar's base.
Sit *thee* down.

§ 525. *Reflective neuters*.—In *I strike me*, the verb *strike* is transitive. In *I fear me*, the verb *fear* is intransitive or neuter; unless indeed *fear* mean *terrify*—which it does not. Hence, the reflective pronoun appears out of place, *i. e.* after a neuter or intransitive verb. Such a use, however, is but the fragment of an extensive system of reflective verbs thus formed, developed in different degrees in the different Gothic languages; but in all more than in the English.

§ 526. *Equivocal reflectives*.—The proper place of the reflective is *after* the verb. The proper place of the governing pronoun is, in the indicative or subjunctive moods, *before* the verb. Hence in expressions like the preceding there is no doubt as to the power of the pronoun. The imperative mood, however, sometimes presents a complication. Here the governing person may *follow* the verb; so that *mount ye* = either *be mounted* or *mount yourselves*. In phrases, then, like this, and in phrases

Busk ye, busk ye, my bonny, bonny bride,
Busk ye, busk ye, my winsome marrow,

the construction is ambiguous. *Ye* may either be a nominative case governing the verb *busk*, or an accusative case governed by it = *yourself*.

§ 527. The words *his*, and *her*, are genitive cases—
not adjectives, being equivalent to

mater ejus, not *mater sua* ;

pater ejus, — *pater suus*.

§ 528. It has already been shown that *its* is a secondary genitive ; and it may now be added that it is of late origin in the language. Hence, when, in the old writers, we meet *his*, where we expect *its*, we must not suppose that any personification takes place, but simply that the old genitive common to the two genders is used in preference to the modern one ; which is limited to the neuter, and irregularly formed.

The apoplexy is, as I take it, a kind of lethargy. I have read the cause of *his* effects in Galen ; *it* is a kind of deafness.—2 *Henry IV.* i. 2.

If the salt have lost *his* savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned ? *It* is neither fit for the land nor yet for the dunghill ; but men cast *it* out.—Luke xiv. 34, 35.

Some affirm that every plant has *his* particular fly or caterpillar, which it breeds and feeds.—WALTON'S *Angler*.

This rule is not so general, but that *it* admitteth of *his* exceptions.—CAREW.

CHAPTER IV.

SYNTAX OF PRONOUNS.—TRUE REFLECTIVE ABSENT IN ENGLISH.—THE WORD SELF.

§ 529. A TRUE reflective pronoun is wanting in English. In other words, there are no equivalents to the Latin pronominal forms *se*, *sibi*. (§ 524.) Nor yet are there any equivalents in English to the so called adjectival forms *suus*, *sua*, *suum*. At first, it seems superfluous to state all this—to say that if there were no such primitive

form as *se*, there could be no such secondary form as *suus*. Such, however, is not really the case. *Suus* might exist, in a language, and yet *se* be absent; in other words, the derivative form might have continued whilst the original one had become extinct. Such is really the case with the *Old Frisian*. The equivalent to *se* is lost, whilst the equivalent to *suus* is found. In the *Modern Frisian*, however, both forms are lost.

§ 530. The history of the reflective pronoun in the German tongues is as follows:—

In Mæso-Gothic.—Found in two cases, *sis*, *sik* = *sibi*, *se*.

In Old Norse.—*Ser*, *sik* = *sibi*, *se*.

In Old High-German.—The dative form lost; there being no such word as *sir* = *sis* = *sibi*.

In Old Frisian.—As stated above, there is here no equivalent to *se*; whilst there is the adjectival form *sin* = *suus*.

In Old Saxon.—The equivalent to *se* and *sibi* very rare. The equivalent to *suus* not common, but commoner than in Anglo-Saxon.

In Anglo-Saxon.—No instance of the equivalent to *se* at all. The forms *sinne* = *suum* and *sinum* = *suo*, occur in *Beowulf*. In *Cædmon* cases of *sin* = *suus* are more frequent. Still the usual form is *his* = *ejus*.

In the *Dutch*, *Danish*, and *Swedish*, the true reflectives, both personal and possessive, occur; so that the modern Frisian and English stand alone in respect to the entire absence of them.

§ 531. The *undoubted* constructions of the word *self*, in the present state of the cultivated English, are three-fold.

1. In *my-self*, *thy-self*, *our-selves*, and *your-selves*, the construction is that of a common substantive with an adjective or genitive case. *My-self* = *my individuality*,

and is similarly construed—*mea individualitas (persona)*,
 • *ex mei individualitas (persona)*.

2. In *him-self* and *them-selves*, when accusative, the construction is that of a substantive in apposition with a pronoun. *Himself* = *him, the individual*.

3. *Composition*.—It is only, however, when *himself* and *themselves* are in the accusative case, that the construction is appositional. When they are used as nominatives, it must be explained on another principle. In phrases like *He himself was present*; *they themselves were present*, there is no government, no concord, no apposition; at least no apposition between *him* and *self*, *them* and *selves*. In this difficulty, the only logical view that can be taken of the matter, is to consider the words *himself* and *themselves*, not as two words, but as a single word compounded; and, even then, the compound will be of an irregular kind; inasmuch as the inflectional element *-m*, is dealt with as part and parcel of the root.

Her-self.—The construction here is *ambiguous*. Since *her* may be either a so-called genitive, like *my*, or an accusative, like *him*.

Itself—is also *ambiguous*. The *s* may represent the *-s* in *its*, as well as the *s-* in *self*.

• This inconsistency is as old as the Anglo-Saxon stage of the English language.

CHAPTER V.

MINE—THINE—OURS, ETC.

§ 532. THERE is a difference between the construction of *my* and *mine*. We do not say *this is mine hat* and we cannot say *this hat is my*. Nevertheless, except as far as

the collocation is concerned, the construction of the two words is the same, *i. e.* it is either that of an adjective *agreeing* with, or that of a possessive case *governed* by, a substantive.

§ 533. A common genitive case can be used in two ways; either as part of a term, or as a whole one.—1. *This is John's hat.* 2. *This hat is John's:* in which case it is said to be used as a Predicate, or Predicatively. And a common adjective can be used in two ways; either as part of a term, or as a whole term. 1. *These are good hats.* 2. *These hats are good.* Now, whether we consider *my*, and the words like it, as adjectives or cases, they possess only *one* of the properties just illustrated, *i. e.* they can only be used as part of a term—*this is my hat*; and not *this hat is my*. And whether we consider *mine*, and the words like it, as adjectives or cases, they possess only *one* of the properties just illustrated, *i. e.* they can only be used as *whole* terms, or Predicatively—*this hat is mine*; not *this is mine hat*.

Hence, for a full and perfect construction, whether of an adjective or a genitive case, the possessive pronouns present the phenomenon of being, singly, incomplete, but complementary to each other when taken in their two forms.

§ 534. In expressions like *my hat*, from which we are unable to separate *my* and use it as a single word, the construction is, nearly, that of the Articles. It is scarcely, however, safe to say that *my*, *thy*, *our*, and *your*, are actual articles. Nevertheless, they are incapable of being used by themselves.

§ 535. In the predicative construction of a genitive case, the term is formed by the single word only so far as the *expression* is concerned. A substantive is always *understood* from what has preceded.—*This discovery is Newton's* = *this discovery is Newton's discovery*.

The same with adjectives.—*This weather is fine = this weather is fine weather.*

And the same with absolute pronouns.—*This hat is mine = this hat is my hat; and this is a hat of mine = this is a hat of my hats.*

CHAPTER VI.

SYNTAX OF PRONOUNS.—THE INDETERMINATE CONSTRUCTION.

§ 536. DIFFERENT languages have different modes of expressing indeterminate propositions. In Greek, Latin, and English, the passive voice is used—*λεγεται, dicitur, it is said*. The Italian uses the reflective pronoun; as, *si dice = it says itself*. Sometimes the plural pronoun of the third person is used. Thus, in our language, *they say = the world at large says*. Finally, *man* has an indeterminate sense in the Modern German; as, *man sagt = man says = they say*. The same word was also used indeterminately in the Old, although it is not so used in the Modern, English. In the Old English, the *-n* was occasionally lost, and *man* or *men* became *me*.

§ 537. The present indeterminate pronoun is *one*; as, *one says = they say = it is said = man sagt, German = on dit, French = si dice, Italian*. It has already been stated that the indeterminate pronoun *one* has no etymological connection with the numeral *one*; but that it is derived from the French *on = homme = homo = man*.

§ 538. Two other pronouns, or, to speak more in accordance with the present habit of the English language, one pronoun, and one adverb of pronominal origin, are also used indeterminately, viz. *it* and *there*.

§ 539. *It* can be either the subject or the predicate of a sentence,—*it is this—this is it—I am it—it is I*. When *it* is the subject of a proposition, the verb necessarily agrees with it, and can be of the singular number only; no matter what be the number of the predicate—*it is this—it is these*. When *it* is the predicate of a proposition, the number of the verb depends upon the number of the subject.

§ 540. *There* can only be the predicate of a proposition; differing in this respect from *it*. Hence, it never affects the number of the verb; which is determined by the nature of the subject—*there is this—there are these*. When we say *there is these*, the analogy between the words *these* and *it* misleads us; the expression being illogical. Furthermore, although a predicate, *there* always stands in the beginning of propositions, *i. e.* in the place of the subject. This also may mislead.

§ 541. Although *it*, when the subject, being itself singular, absolutely requires that its verb should be singular also, there is, in German, such an expression as—*es sind menschen* = *it are men*; where *es* the English *there*.

§ 542. In such phrases as *it rains, it snows, it freezes*, it would be hard to say, in express terms, what *it* stands for. Suppose we are asked *what rains? what snows? what freezes?*—the answer is difficult. We might say *the rain, the weather, the sky*, or what not. Yet, none of these answers is satisfactory. To say the *rain rains, the sky rains, &c.*, sounds strange. Yet we all know the meaning of the expression—obscure as it may be in its details. We all know that the word *it* is essential to the sentence; and that if we omitted it and simply said *rains*, the grammar would be faulty. We also know that it is the subject of the proposition. In the old grammars, the word *Deus* (*God*) was held to be the subject.

<i>Pluit,</i>	raynes	Deus meus.
<i>Gelat,</i>	freses	— tuus.
<i>Degelat,</i>	thowes	— suus.
<i>Ningit,</i>	snawes	— ipsius.
<i>Tonat,</i>	thoneres	— sanctus.
<i>Grandinat,</i>	hayles	— omnipotens.
<i>Fulgurat,</i>	lownes	— creator.

See Wright's volume of Vocabularies from the Tenth Century to the Fifteenth.

CHAPTER VII.

SYNTAX OF PRONOUNS.—ARTICLES.

§ 543. IN the generality of grammars the definite article *the*, and the indefinite article *an*, are the very first parts of speech that are considered. This is exceptionable. So far are they from being essential to language, that, in many dialects, they are wholly wanting. In Latin the words *filius patris* mean equally *the son of the father*, *a son of a father*, *a son of the father*, or *the son of a father*. But, though the Latin language has no article, each and all of the languages derived from it have one. The French has the article *le* = *the*, and *un* = *one*. So have the Italian, the Spanish, &c. But the Wallachian is the most remarkable. In Wallachian, or Moldavian, the article *follows* the noun to which it belongs. It also coalesces with it, so that the two form one word. Thus if *om* = *man*, the combination *om-ul* = *the man*. In this case it is *post-positive*, or placed after the substantive. This *post-position* is, by no means, rare. Neither is its amalgamation

with the substantive. What occurs in the Wallachian occurs in the Icelandic also. So it does in the Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, and Feroic, derived from it. All this suggests the likelihood of the article being one of those parts of speech which originate during the later rather than the earlier stages of language. It also suggests a manner in which a part of speech, originally non-existent in a language, may be developed. If the Latin be the mother-tongue of the French, &c., and these contain articles, how came those articles there? Though, wanting in the old Roman, the materials out of which they might be developed, were present. The Latin had the word *unus* = *one*. It had also the words *ille*, *illa* = *he* and *she*. Now the French *un* = *a* = *unus*; the indefinite article having grown out of the numeral. And the French *le* = *ille*; the definite article having grown out of the demonstrative pronoun. Neither was the French process of evolution or development peculiar. The articles of *all* the allied languages arose out of *unus* and *ille*; and, *mutatis mutandis*, the origin of the articles in the languages allied to our own is the same. What is *the* but a word of the same origin with the demonstrative *th-is* or *tha-t*? What is *a* but *an*; and *an* but *án* or *ane*, and *án* or *ane* but *onc*? The article, however, differs from the Pronoun, in being incapable of existing, except in conjunction with either a substantive or some other pronoun.

§ 541. The articles in English are *the*, *an*, *no*, and *every*. More than one competent writer has already suggested that *no* is an article. If so, it must, of course, be considered as different in its construction from the ordinary negative. It has no independent existence. It *has* an existence when coupled with a substantive or another pronoun. It = *not one*, and *none*, in power. The construction of *every* is exactly the construction

of *no*. We can say *every man* as we can say *no man*, and *every one* as we can say *no one*; but we cannot say *every* and *no* alone.

§ 545. When two or more substantives, following each other, denote the same object, the article precedes the first only. Thus—we say, *the secretary and treasurer*, when the two offices are held by one person. When two or more substantives following each other denote different objects, the article is repeated, and precedes each. We say *the* (or *a*) *secretary and the* (or *a*) *treasurer*, when the two offices are held by different persons. This rule is much neglected.

§ 546. Before a consonant, *an* becomes *a*; as *an axe*, *a man*. In *adder*, which is properly *nadder*, and in *nag*, which is properly *ag*, there is a misdivision. So, also, in the old glossaries.

<i>Hec auris</i>	a nore	i. e. an ear.
<i>hec aquila</i>	a neggle	— an eagle.
<i>hec angulla</i>	a nele	— an eel
<i>hec erinaceus</i>	a nurehon	— an urchin.
<i>hec comes</i>	a nerle	— an earl.
<i>hec senior</i>	a nald man	— an old man
<i>hec erul</i>	a nowtlay	— an outlaw.
<i>hec lutreus</i>	a notyie	— an otter
<i>hec alba</i>	a nawbe	— an aube.
<i>hec amictus</i>	a namyt	— an amice.
<i>hec securis</i>	a nax	— an axe.
<i>hec axis</i>	a naxyltre	— an axletre.
<i>hec ancora</i>	a nankyre	— an anchor.

CHAPTER VIII.

SYNTAX OF PRONOUNS.—THE NUMERALS.

§ 547. THE numeral *one* is naturally singular. All the rest are naturally plural. Nevertheless such expressions—*one two* (= *one collection of two*), *two threes* (= *two*

collections of three), are legitimate. They are so because the sense of the word is changed. We may talk of several *ones* just as we may talk of several *aces*; and of *one two* just as of *one pair*.

§ 548. Expressions like the *thousandth-and-first* are incorrect. They mean neither one thing nor another; 1001st being expressed by *the thousand-and-first*, and 1000th + 1st being expressed by *the thousandth and the first*. And, here it may be noticed that, although I never found it to do so, the word *odd* is capable of taking an ordinal form. The *thousand-and-odd-th* is as good an expression as the *thousand-and-eigh-th*. In words of this kind the construction is that of *the king-of-Saxony's army*.

§ 549. It is by no means a matter of indifference whether we say the *two first* or the *first two*. The captains of two different classes at school should be called the *two first boys*. The first and second boys of the same class should be called the *first two boys*.

CHAPTER IX.

SYNTAX OF SUBSTANTIVES.

§ 550. A SUBSTANTIVE is an *Invariable* name, which can form *either* the Subject or the Predicate of a Proposition.

A Substantive is an *Invariable* name; herein differing from the Pronoun, which is *Variable*.

The Declension of the Substantive is more limited than that of the Pronoun. It gives but two Cases, and no Gender.

§ 551. *Ellipsis of substantives*.—The historical view of

phrases, like *Rundell and Bridge's, St. Paul's, &c.*, shows that this ellipsis is common to the English and the other Gothic languages. Furthermore it shows that it is met with in languages not of the Gothic stock; and, finally, that the class of words to which it applies, is, there or thereabouts, the same generally. Thus—

The words most commonly understood are (1.) *house* and *family*, or words reducible to them. In Latin *Dianæ = ædem Dianæ*. (2.) *Country, retinue*. (3.) *Son, daughter, wife, widow*.—Νηλεὺς Κόδρου, Greek.

§ 552. The following phrases are referable to a different class of relations—

1. *Right and left*—supply *hand*. This is, probably, a real ellipsis. The words *right* and *left* have not yet become true substantives; inasmuch as they have no plural forms. In this respect, they stand in contrast with *bitter* and *sweet*; inasmuch as we can say *he has tasted both the bitters and the sweets of life*.

2. *All fours*.—*To go on all fours*. No ellipsis. The word *fours* is a true substantive, as proved by its existence as a plural.

§ 553. *Proper names can only be used in the singular number*.—Proper or individual names are essentially *singular*, and it is a common, as well as a true, statement that no *individual name can be plural*. How, then, can we use such expressions as *both the Bostons are important sea-ports*, or, *as long as Mæcanases abound Maros will be plentiful?* = *Sint Mæcanates non deerunt, Flacce, Marones?* The *Boston* in Lincolnshire is a different town from the *Boston* in Massachusetts; so that, though the same combination of sounds or letters applies to both, it cannot be said that the same *name* is so applied. The same name is one thing. The same word applied to different objects is another. A name is only so far individual as it applies to some individual object. The two Bostons,

however, are different objects. In the case of *Mæcænas* and *Virgil* there are but two individuals—one *Mæcænas*, and one *Virgil*. *Mæcænas*, however, is something more than the particular patron of *Virgil*. He is the sample, type, or representative of *patrons in general*. *Virgil*, in like manner, is something more than the particular poet patronized by *Mæcænas*. He stands for *poets in general*. Hence, the meaning of the Latin line and of the English sentence that preceded it, is this:—*As long as there are men like Mæcænas, there will also be men like Virgil*. But a man like *Mæcænas* is a patron, and a man like *Virgil* a poet. Hence—*As long as there are patrons there will be poets also*. When we say *the four Georges; the Pitts and Camdens, &c.*, the words that thus take a plural form have ceased to be proper names. They either mean the persons called *George, &c.*, or, persons, so like *George*, that they may be considered as identical.

§ 554. *Collocation*.—In the present English, the genitive case always precedes the noun by which it is governed—*the man's hat* = *hominis pileus*; never *the hat man's* = *pileus hominis*.

CHAPTER X.

SYNTAX OF ADJECTIVES.

§ 555. AN Adjective is a word which can form the Predicate, but not the Subject, of a Proposition.

An Adjective is a word suggestive of a name rather than an actual name itself.

The name suggested by an adjective is always that of an abstraction.

The Declension of the Adjective is more limited than

that of the Substantive. It gives neither Case nor Number.

It has, however, an Inflection which is wanting both to the Substantive and the Pronoun viz. that of Degree.

§ 556. *Pleonasm*.—Pleonasm can take place with adjectives only in the expression of the degrees of comparison.

The more serene spirit.

The most straitest sect.

§ 557. *Collocation*.—As a general rule, the adjective precedes the substantive—*a good man*, not *a man good*. When, however, the adjective is qualified by either the expression of its mode, or accompanied by another adjective, it may follow the substantive—

A man just and good.

A woman wise and fair.

A hero devoted to his country.

A patriot disinterested to a great degree.

Single simple adjectives thus placed after their substantive, belong to the poetry of England, and especially to the ballad poetry—*sighs profound—the leaves green*.

§ 558. *Government*.—The only adjective that governs a case, is the word *like*. In the expression *this is like him*, &c., the original power of the dative remains. This is an inference from the facts—

That (1) in most languages which have inflections to a sufficient extent, the word meaning *like* governs a dative case; that (2) if ever we use in English any preposition at all to express similitude, it is the preposition *to*—*like to me, like to death*, &c.

§ 559. Expressions, such as *full of meat, good for John*, are by no means instances of the government of adjectives; the really governing words being the prepositions *of* and *for* respectively. Hence, the most that can be said, in cases like these, is that particular adjec-

tives determine the use of particular prepositions—thus the preposition *of* generally follows the adjective *full*, &c.

§ 560. The positive preceded by the adjective *more*, is equivalent to the comparative—*e. g. more wise = wiser*. The reasons for employing one expression in preference to the other, depend upon the nature of the particular word used. When it is, at one and the same time, of Anglo-Saxon origin and monosyllabic, there is no doubt about the preference to be given to the form in *-er*. Thus, *wis-er* is preferable to *more wise*. When, however, the word is compound or trisyllabic, the combination with the word *more* is preferable—

more fruitful being better than *fruitfuller*.

more villanous *villanouser*.

Between these two extremes, there are several intermediate forms wherein the use of one rather than another will depend upon the taste of the writer. The question, however, is a question of euphony, rather than of aught else. It is also illustrated by the principle of not multiplying secondary elements. In words like *fruitfuller* and *fruitfullest* there are two additions to the root.

§ 561. *Predicative Adjectives*.—In propositions like *man is mortal*, the Adjective forms the Predicate. So doing, it stands by itself, or (if not by itself) as the essential portion of a term. So, also, *man is altogether mortal*, *man is certainly mortal*, &c. But, it is only as a Predicate that any Adjective can, by itself, constitute a whole term; for in propositions like—*mortal man is fallible*, *great is the fallibility of mortal man*, it forms but the *part* of a term, being subordinate to the Substantive; with which it is said to agree.

§ 562. Many good Grammarians call the former of these the Predicative, the latter the Attributive powers of the Adjective. The first name is unexceptionable. Not

so the latter. *All* Adjectives, whether Predicative or not, denote an attribute. The expression, however, is in general use. In the English language, however, this distinction is of no very great importance—inasmuch as English Adjectives are destitute of inflection. In German, however, and certain other languages, the form of the Adjective varies according to its power.

§ 563. In propositions like—

Great is Diana of the Ephesians,

the order of terms is reversed, and the Predicate precedes, instead of following, the Copula. Expressions of this kind, *in declaratory propositions*, are, more or less, rhetorical.

§ 564. Certain Adjectives in the Neuter Gender may be used as adverbs; as *the sun shines brightly; the time flies fast; the snail moves slow.*

These are expressions to which many grammarians object. Doubtless, it is better to say *brightly* and *slowly*. There is one class of words, however, where we have no choice, viz. the Adjectives in *-ly* (from *like*). It has already been stated that we cannot derive *dailily* from *daily*; in other words, that no such adverb as *dailily* exists. There exist, however, such phrases as *he labours daily; he sleeps nightly; he watches hourly*, and others; in all of which the simple Adjective is used as an adverb.

CHAPTER XI.

SYNTAX OF VERBS.—ON VERBS IN GENERAL.

§ 565. A VERB is a word which can, by itself, form both the Predicate and Copula of a Proposition, as, *The sun shines.*

For the purposes of Syntax it is convenient to divide verbs into—(1) Intransitive, (2) Transitive, (3) Auxiliar, (4) Substantive, (5) and Impersonal.

§ 566. *Intransitive and Transitive*.—A transitive verb implies an object affected; as, *I move my limbs*, and *I strike the enemy*. An act, however, may take place, and yet no object be affected by it. *To hunger, to thirst, to sleep, to wake*, are verbs that indicate states of being rather than actions affecting objects. As such, they are *Intransitive*.

§ 567. Many verbs, naturally transitive, may be used as intransitive,—*e. g. I move, I strike, &c.* Many verbs, naturally intransitive, may be used as transitives,—*e. g. I walked the horse = I made the horse walk.*

§ 568. Transitive verbs are naturally followed by some noun or other; and that noun is *always* the name of something affected by them *as an object*.

§ 569. Intransitive verbs are not naturally followed by any noun at all; and when they are so followed, the noun is *never* the name of anything affected by them *as an object*.

§ 570. *The partitive construction*.—Certain transitive verbs, the action whereof is extended not to the whole, but only to a part of their object, are followed by the preposition *of* and an objective case. *To eat of the fruit of the tree = to eat a part (or some) of the fruit of the tree : to drink of the water of the well = to drink a part (or some) of the water of the well.* It is not necessary, here, to suppose the ellipsis of the word *part (or some)*. The construction is a construction that has grown out of the partitive power of the genitive case; for which case the preposition *of*, followed by the objective, serves as an equivalent. No verb, however, in the present English *directly governs* a genitive case. In Anglo-Saxon certain verbs did: *e. g. verbs of ruling* and

others—*weolde thises middangeardes* = *he ruled (wealded) this earth's*. Genitive cases, too, governed by a verb are common both in Latin and Greek.

§ 571. *The verb and dative case.*—The word *give*, with a few others, governs a dative case. Phrases like *give it him, whom shall I give it?* are perfectly correct, and have been explained above. The prepositional construction in *give it to him*, or *to whom shall I give it?* is unnecessary.

§ 572. From this it follows that, in English, the transitive verb governs the objective case; the objective case having an exclusively accusative power—all exceptions to this being apparent rather than real.

§ 573. The government of verbs, as illustrated by the preceding examples, is *objective*. But it may also be *modal*. It is modal when the noun which follows the verb is not the name of any object affected by the verb, but the name of something explaining the manner in which the action of the verb takes place, the instrument with which it is done, the end for which it is done, &c.

The government of transitive verbs is necessarily objective. It may also be modal,—*I strike the enemy with the sword* = *ferio hostem gladio*.

The government of intransitive verbs can only be modal,—*I walk with the stick*. When we say *I walk the horse*, the word *walk* has changed its meaning, and signifies *make to walk*, and is, by the very fact of its being followed by the name of an object, converted from an intransitive into a transitive verb.

The modal construction may also be called the *adverbial construction*; because the effect of the noun is akin to that of an adverb,—*I fight with bravery* = *I fight bravely*; *he walks a king* = *he walks regally*.

§ 574. The modal construction sometimes takes the

appearance of the objective: inasmuch as intransitive verbs are frequently followed by a substantive; which substantive is in the objective case. *To break the sleep of the righteous* is *to affect, by breaking, the sleep of the righteous*: but, *to sleep the sleep of the righteous*, is not *to affect, by sleeping, the sleep of the righteous*; since the act of sleeping is an act that affects no object whatever. It is a *state*. We may, indeed, give it the appearance of a transitive verb, as we do when we say, *the opiate slept the patient*, meaning thereby *lulled to sleep*; but the transitive character is only apparent. *To sleep the sleep of the righteous* is *to sleep in agreement with—or according to—or after the manner of—the sleep of the righteous*, and the construction is adverbial.

CHAPTER XII.

SYNTAX OF VERBS—CONCORD.

§ 575. THE verb must agree with its subject in person, —*I walk*, not *I walks*; *he walks*, not *he walk*. It must also agree with it in number,—*we walk*, not *we walks*; *he walks*, not *he walk*.

§ 576. *Verb and nominative case*.—No verb governs a nominative case. In *it is I*, *it is thou*, *it is he*, &c., the word *is* is *followed* by a nominative case; yet it, by no means, *governs* one. The so-called verb-substantive is only a verb for the purposes of etymology. In syntax it is only a *part* of a verb.

I speak may, logically, be reduced to *I am speaking*; in which case it is only the *part* of a verb. Etymologically, indeed, the verb substantive is a verb;

inasmuch as it is inflected as such : but for the purposes of construction, it is a copula only, *i. e.* it merely denotes the agreement or disagreement between the subject and the predicate. Now the predicate need agree with the subject in case only.

1. It has no necessary concord in *gender*—*she is a man in courage—he is a woman in effeminacy—it is a girl.*

2. It has no necessary concord in *number*—*sin is the wages of death—it is these that do the mischief.*

3. It has no necessary concord in *person*—*I am he whom you mean.*

4. It *has*, however, a necessary concord in *case*. Nothing but a nominative case can, by itself, constitute a term of either kind—subject or predicate. Hence, both terms must be in the nominative, and, consequently, both in the same case. Expressions like *this is for me* are elliptic. The logical expression is *this is a thing for me.*



CHAPTER XIII.

SYNTAX OF VERBS—MOODS.

§ 577. THE infinitive mood is a noun. The current rule—that *when two verbs come together the latter is placed in the infinitive mood*—means that one verb can govern another only by converting it into a noun,—*I begin to move* = *I begin the act of moving*. Verbs, as verbs, can only come together in the way of apposition,—*I irritate, I beat, I talk at him, I call him names, &c.* The construction, however, of English infinitives is twofold. (1.) Infinitive Proper. (2.) Gerundial.

§ 578. *Infinitives*.—When one verb is followed by

another *without* the preposition *to*, the construction must be considered to have grown out of the A.S. form in *-an*

I may go,	<i>not</i> I may <i>to</i> go.	I should wait, <i>not</i> I should <i>to</i> wait.
I might go,	— I might <i>to</i> go.	Let me go, — Let me <i>to</i> go.
I can move,	— I can <i>to</i> move.	He let me go, — He let me <i>to</i> go.
I could move	— I could <i>to</i> move.	I do speak, — I do <i>to</i> speak.
I will speak,	— I will <i>to</i> speak.	I did speak, — I did <i>to</i> speak.
I would speak,	— I would <i>to</i> speak.	I dare go, — I dare <i>to</i> go.
I shall wait,	— I shall <i>to</i> wait.	I durst go, — I durst <i>to</i> go.

Thou shalt not *see* thy brother's ox or his ass *fall* down by the way.

We *heard* him *say*, I will destroy the temple.

I *feel* the pain *abate*.

He *bid* her *alight*.

I would fain *have* any one *name* to me that tongue that any one can speak as he should do by the rules of grammar.

This, in the present English, is the rarer of the two constructions.

§ 579. *Gerundial*.—When one verb is followed by another, preceded by the preposition *to*, *i. e.* *I begin to move*, the construction must be considered to have grown out of the A.S. form in *-nne*. This is the case with the great majority of English verbs. The following examples, from the Old English, of the gerundial construction where we have, at present, the objective, are Dr. Guest's:—

1. Eilrid *myght nought to stand* þam ageyn.

R. BR.

2. Whether feith schall *move to save* him?

WYCLIFFE, James ii.

3. My woful child what flight *maist thou to take*?

HIGGINS, *Lady Sabine*, 4.

4. Never to retourne no more,
Except he *would* his life to loose therfore.

HIGGINS, *King Albanaet*, 6.

5. He said he *could not to forsake* my love.

HIGGINS, *Queen Elstride*, 20.

6. The mayster *lette* X men and mo
To wende. Octavian, 381.
7. And though we owe the fall of Troy requite,
 Yet *let* revenge thereof from gods to lighte.
 HIGGINS, *King Albanact*, 16.
8. *I durst*, my lord, *to wager* she is honest.
 OTHELLO, iv. 2.
9. Whom when on ground she grovelling *saw to roll*
 She ran in haste. *Faëry Queen*, iv. 7, 32

§ 580. *I am to speak*.—Three facts explain this idiom.

1. The idea of *direction towards an object* conveyed by the dative case and by combinations equivalent to it.

2. The extent to which the ideas of necessity, obligation, or intention are connected with the idea of *something that has to be done, or something towards which some action has a tendency*.

3. The fact that expressions like the one in question historically represent an original dative case or its equivalent; since *to speak* grows out of the Anglo-Saxon form *to spreccanne*, which, although called a gerund, is really a dative case of the infinitive mood.

. Johnson thought that, in the *phrase he is to blame*, the word *blame* was a noun. If he meant a noun in the way that *culpa* is one, his view was wrong. But if he meant a noun in the way that *culpare*, and *ad culpandum*, are nouns, it was right.

I am to blame.—This idiom is one degree more complex than the previous one; since *I am to blame* = *I am to be blamed*. As early, however, as the Anglo-Saxon period, the gerunds were liable to be used in a passive sense: *he is to lufigenne* = not *he is to love*, but *he is to be loved*.

The principle of this confusion may be discovered by

considering that *an object to be blamed is an object for some one to blame*, just as *an object to be loved is an object for some one to love*.

§ 581. Imperatives have three peculiarities. (1.) They can in English only be used in the second person: (2.) They take pronouns after, instead of before, them: (3.) They often omit the pronoun altogether.

CHAPTER XIV.

TIME AND TENSE.

§ 582. *Time* is one thing; *tense* another. Such statements as identify them are exceptionable. The etymology of the last word is *tensio*, denoting a state of *tension* or *extension*, a word which like *case*, as applied to nouns, gives us a metaphor rather than a fact. *Tense* is to *time*, much as *gender* is to *sex*; i. e. a grammatical name for a natural condition: and as *sex* and *gender* were carefully distinguished from each other so should we carefully distinguish *Tense* and *Time*. To constitute a tense there must be an inflection. *Vocat* in Latin, and *calls* in English are tenses. *Vocatus sum* and *I have called* are combinations, which, so far as they express time, partake of the nature of tenses.

§ 583. The following is an exhibition of some of the *times* in which an action may take place, as found in the English and other languages, expressed by the use of either an inflection or a combination.

Time considered in one point only—

1. *Present*.—An action taking place at the time of speaking, and incomplete.—*I am beating, I am being beaten.* Not expressed, in English, by the simple present tense; since *I beat* means *I am in the habit of beating*.

2. *Aorist*.—An action that took place in past time, or previous to the time of speaking, and which has no connection with the time of speaking,—*I struck, I was stricken.* Expressed, in English, by the præterite, in Greek by the aorist. The term aorist, from the Greek ἀ-όριστος = *undefined*, is a convenient name for this sort of time.

3. *Future*.—An action that has neither taken place, nor is taking place at the time of speaking, but which is stated as one which *will* take place.—Expressed, in English, by the combination of *will* or *shall* with an infinitive mood; in Latin and Greek by an inflection. *I shall (or will) speak, λέκ-σω, dica-m.*

None of these expressions imply more than a single action; in other words, they have no relation to any second action occurring simultaneously with them, before them, or after them,—*I am speaking now, I spoke yesterday, I shall speak to-morrow.*

By considering past, present, or future actions not only by themselves, but as related to other past, present, or future actions, we get fresh varieties of expression. Thus, an act may have been going on, when some other act, itself one of past time, interrupted it. Here the action agrees with a present action in being incomplete; but it differs from it in having been rendered incomplete by an action that is past. This is exactly the case with the—

4. *Imperfect*.—*I was reading when he entered.* Here we have two acts; the act of *reading* and the act of *entering*. Both are past as regards the time of speaking, but

both are present as regards each other. This is expressed, in English, by the past tense of the verb substantive and the present participle, *I was speaking*; and in Latin and Greek by the imperfect tense, *dicebam*, ἔτυπτον.

5. *Perfect*.—Action past, but connected with the present by its effects or consequences.—*I have written, and here is the letter*. Expressed in English by the auxiliary verb *have* followed by the *participle passive in the accusative case and neuter gender of the singular number*. The Greek expresses this by the reduplicate perfect: τέ-τυφα = *I have beaten*.

6. *Pluperfect*.—Action past, but connected with a second action subsequent to it, *which is also past*—*I had written when he came in*.

7. *Future present*.—Action future as regards the time of speaking, present as regards some future time.—*I shall be speaking about this time to-morrow*.

8. *Future præterite*.—Action future as regards the time of speaking, past as regards some future time.—*I shall have spoken by this time to-morrow*.

§ 584. These are the chief expressions which are simply determined by the relations of actions to each other and to the time of speaking, either in the English or any other language. But over and above the simple idea of *time*, there may be others superadded: thus, the phrase, *I do speak*, means, not only that *I am in the habit of speaking*, but that I also *insist* upon it being understood that I am so.

Again, an action that is mentioned as either taking place, or as having taking place at a given time, may take place again and again. Hence the idea of *habit* may arise out of the idea of either present time or aorist time.

§ 585. 1. *The emphatic present and præterite*.—Ex-

pressed by *do* (or *did*), as stated above. A man says *I do* (or *did*) *speak, read, &c.*, when, either directly or • by implication, it is asserted or implied that he does not. As a question implies doubt, *do* is used in interrogations.

Do et did indicant emphatice tempus præsens et præteritum imperfectum. *Uro, urebam; I burn, I burned: vel (emphatice) I do burn, I did burn.*—WALLIS, p. 106.

2. *The predictive future.*—*I shall be there to-morrow.* This means simply that the speaker will be present. It gives no clue to the circumstances that will determine his being so.

3. *The promissive future.*—*I will be there to-morrow.*—This means not only that the speaker will be present, but that he *intends* being so.

4. That the power of the present tense is, in English, not present, but habitual, has already been stated.

§ 586. *The representative expression of past and future time.*—An action may be past; yet, for the sake of bringing it more vividly before the hearers, we may make it present. *He walks* (for *walked*) *up to him, and knocks* (for *knocked*) *him down*, is, by no means, the natural habitual power of the English present. So, in respect to a future, *I beat you if you don't leave off*, for *I will beat you*. This is sometimes called the *historic* use of the present tense. I find it more convenient to call it the representative use: inasmuch as it is used more after the principles of painting than of history; the former of which, necessarily, *represents* things as present, the latter, more naturally, describes them as *past*.

The use of the representative present to express simple actions is unequivocally correct. To the expression, however, of complex actions it gives an illogical character,—*As I was doing this he enters* (for *entered*). Nevertheless,

such a use of the present is a fact in language, and we must take it as it occurs.

§ 587. The present time can be used instead of the future; and that on the principle of representation. Can a future be used for a present? No.

The present tense can be used instead of the aorist; and that on the principle of representation. Can a past time be used for a present?

In respect to the perfect tense, where it exists, there is no doubt. The answer is in the affirmative. For all purposes of syntax a perfect tense, or a combination equivalent to one, is a present. Contrast the expression, *I come that I may see*; with the expression, *I came that I might see*; i. e. the present construction with the aorist. Then, bring in the perfect construction, *I have come*. It differs with the aorist, and agrees with the present—*I have come that I may see*. The reason for this is clear. There is not only a present element in all perfects, but for the purposes of syntax, the present element predominates. Hence expressions like *I shall go*, need give us no trouble; even though *shall* be considered as a perfect tense. Suppose the root *sk-ll* to mean *to be destined* (or *fated*). Provided we consider the effects of the action to be continued up to the time of speaking, we may say, *I have been destined to go*, just as well as we can say *I am destined to go*.

The use of the aorist as a present (except so far as both the tenses agree in their power of expressing *habitual* actions) is a more difficult investigation. It bears upon such expressions as *I ought to go*, &c., for which see §§ 468—471. It is necessary to remember that the connection between the present and the past time, which is involved in the idea of a perfect tense (τέτυφα), or perfect combination (*I have beaten*), is of several sorts. It may consist in the *present proof* of the *past fact*,—*I have*

written, and here is the evidence that I have done so. It may consist in the present effects of the past fact,—I have written, and here is the answer.

Without either enumerating or classifying these different kinds of connection, it is necessary to indicate two sorts of *inference* to which they may give origin.

1. *The inference of continuance.*—When a person says, *I have learned my lesson*, we presume that he can say it, i. e. that he has a present knowledge of it. Upon this principle $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta\mu\alpha\iota = I \text{ have earned} = I \text{ possess}$. The past action is assumed to be continued in its effects.

2. *The inference of contrast.*—When a person says, *I have been young*, we presume that he is so no longer. The action is past, but it is continued up to the time of speaking by the contrast which it supplies. Upon this principle, *fuit Ilium* means *Ilium is no more*.

In speaking, this difference can be expressed by a difference of accent.—*I have learned my lesson*, implies that *I don't mean to learn it again*. *I have learned my lesson*, implies that *I can say it*.

§ 588. Notwithstanding its name, the present tense, in English, does not express a strictly *present* action. It rather expresses an habitual one. *He speaks well* = *he is a good speaker*. If a man means to say that he is in the act of speaking, he says *I am speaking*. It has also, especially when combined with a subjunctive mood, a future power—*I beat you* (= *I will beat you*) *if you don't leave off*. Again—the English præterite is the equivalent, not to the Greek perfect, but the Greek aorist. *I beat* = $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\lambda\alpha$, not $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\phi\alpha$. The true perfect is expressed, in English, by the auxiliary *have* + the past participle.

CHAPTER XV.

SYNTAX OF VERBS.—IMPERSONALS.

§ 589. *Meseems*.—Equivalent to *it seems to me*; *mihi videtur*; φαίνεται μοι. Here, *seems* is intransitive; and *me* has the power of a dative case.

Methinks.—In the Anglo-Saxon there are two forms; *pencan* = *to think*, and *pincan* = *to seem*. It is from the latter that the verb in *methinks* comes. The verb is intransitive; the pronoun dative.

Methought I saw my late espoused wife
Brought to me, like Alcestis, from the grave.

MILTON.

Me listeth or *me lists*.—Equivalent to *it pleases me* = *me juvat*. Anglo-Saxon *lystan* = *to wish, to choose, also to please, to delight*. Unlike the other two, the verb is transitive, so that *me* is accusative. These three are the only true impersonal verbs in the English language. They form a class by themselves, because no pronoun accompanies them, as is the case with the equivalent expressions *it appears, it pleases*, and with all the other verbs in the language.

CHAPTER XVI.

SYNTAX OF VERBS.—THE AUXILIARIES.

§ 590. THE auxiliary verbs, in English, play a most important part in the Syntax of the language. They may be classified upon a variety of principles. The following, however, are all that need here be applied.

§ 591. *According to their inflectional or non-inflectional*

powers.—Inflectional auxiliaries are those that may either replace or be replaced by an inflection. Thus—*I am struck* = the Latin *ferior*, and the Greek *τύπτομαι*. These auxiliaries are in the same relation to verbs that prepositions are to nouns. The chief inflectional auxiliaries are:—

1. *Have*; equivalent to an inflection in the way of tense—*I have bitten* = *mo-mordi*.

2. *Shall*; ditto. *I shall call* = *voc-abo*.

3. *Will*; ditto. *I will call* = *voc-abo*.

4. *May*; equivalent to an inflection in the way of mood. *I am come that I may see* = *venio ut vid-eam*.

5. *Be*; equivalent to an inflection in the way of voice. *To be beaten* = *verberari*, *τύπτεσθαι*.

6. *Am, art, is, are*; ditto. Also equivalent to an inflection in the way of tense. *I am moving* = *move-o*.

7. *Was, were*; ditto. *I was beaten* = *ε-τύφθην*: *I was moving* = *move-bam*.

§ 592. *According to their non-auxiliary significations*.—The power of the word *have* in the combination *I have a horse*, is clear enough. It means possession. The power of the same word in the combination *I have been*, is not so clear; nevertheless it is a power which has grown out of the idea of possession. This shows that the power of a verb as an auxiliary may be a modification of its original power; *i. e.* of the power it has in non-auxiliary constructions. Sometimes the difference is very little: the word *let*, in *let us go*, has its natural sense of permission unimpaired. Sometimes it is all but lost. *Can* and *may* exist chiefly as auxiliaries.

1. Auxiliary derived from the idea of possession—*have*.

2. Auxiliaries derived from the idea of existence—*be, is, was*.

3. Auxiliary derived from the idea of future destina-

tion dependent upon circumstances external to the agent—*shall*.

4. Auxiliary derived from the idea of future destination dependent upon the volition of the agent—*will*. *Shall* is simply predictive; *will* is predictive and promissive as well.

5. Auxiliary derived from the idea of power, dependent upon circumstances external to the agent—*may*.

6. Auxiliary derived from the idea of power, dependent upon circumstances internal to the agent—*can*. *May* is simply permissive; *can* is potential. In respect to the idea of power residing in the agent being the cause which determines a contingent action, *can* is in the same relation to *may* as *will* is to *shall*.

7. Auxiliary derived from the idea of sufferance—*let*.

8. Auxiliary derived from the idea of necessity—*must*.

9. Auxiliary derived from the idea of action—*do*.

§ 593. *In respect to their mode of construction.*—Auxiliary verbs combine with others in three ways.

1. *With participles.*—*a)* With the present, or active participle—*I am speaking*: *b)* With the past, or passive, participle—*I am beaten, I have beaten*.

2. *With infinitives.*—*a)* With the objective infinitive—*I can speak*: *b)* With the gerundial infinitive—*I have to speak*.

3. *With both infinitives and participles.*—*I shall have done, I mean to have done*.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE PARTICIPLE.

§ 594. A PARTICIPLE, like an adjective, can form the predicate of a proposition, but not the subject.

A participle is a word suggestive of a name rather than a name itself.

The name suggested by a participle is always that of an agent.

The declension of the English participle is more limited than that of the adjective. It gives no degrees.

§ 595. For the forms in *-ing* see § 282. When substantives, they are in regimen, and govern a genitive case—*What is the meaning of the lady's holding up her train?* Here the word *holding* = *the act of holding*.—*Quid est significatio elevationis pallæ de parte fæminæ?*

When participles, they are in apposition or concórd, and would, if inflected, appear in the same case with the substantive, or pronoun, preceding them—*What is the meaning of the lady holding up her train?* Here the word *holding* = *in the act of holding*, and answers to the Latin *fæminæ elevantis*.—*Quid est significatio fæminæ elevantis pallam?*

§ 596. The combination of the auxiliary *have* with the past participle, requires notice. It is, here, advisable to make the following classifications:—

1. The combination with the participle of a *transitive verb*,—*I have ridden the horse; thou hast broken the sword; he has smitten the enemy.*

2. The combination with the participle of an *intransitive verb*,—*I have waited; thou hast hungered; he has slept.*

3. The combination with the participle of the verb substantive,—*I have been; thou hast been; he has been.*

It is by examples of the first of these three divisions that the true construction is to be shown.

For an object of any sort to be in the possession of a person, it must previously have existed. If I possess a horse, that horse must have had a previous existence. Hence, in all expressions like *I have ridden a horse*,

there are two ideas, a past idea in the participle, and a present idea in the word denoting possession.

For an object of any sort, affected in a particular manner, to be in the possession of a person, it must previously have been affected in the manner required. If I possess a horse that has been ridden, the riding must have taken place before I mention the fact of the ridden horse being in my possession; inasmuch as I speak of it as a thing already done,—the participle, *ridden*, being in the past tense.

I have ridden a horse = I have a horse ridden = I have a horse as a ridden horse. In this case the syntax is of the usual sort. (1.) *Have* = *own* = *habeo* = *teneo*; (2.) *horse* is the accusative case = *equum*; (3.) *ridden* is a past participle, agreeing either with *horse*, or *with a word in apposition with it understood*. Mark the words in italics. The word *ridden* does *not* agree with *horse*, since it is, virtually, of the neuter gender. Neither, if we said *I have ridden the horses*, would it agree with *horses*; since it is of the singular number.

The true construction is arrived at by supplying the word *thing*. *I have a horse as a ridden thing = habeo equum equitatum* (neuter).

I have horses as a ridden thing = habeo equos equitatum (singular neuter).

The combination of *have* with an intransitive verb is irreducible to the idea of possession: indeed it is illogical. In *I have waited*, we cannot make the idea expressed by the word *waited* the object of the verb *have* or *possess*. The expression has become a part of language by means of the extension of a false analogy. It is an instance of an illegitimate imitation.

The combination of *have* with *been* is more illogical still, and is a stronger instance of the influence of an illegitimate imitation. In German and Italian, where even

intransitive verbs are combined with the equivalents to the English *have* (*haben* and *avere*), the verb-substantive is not so combined; on the contrary, the combinations are—

Italian; *io sono stato* = *I am been*

German; *ich bin gewesen* = *ditto*.

which is logical.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE SYNTAX OF ADVERBS.

§ 597. AN adverb is a word incapable of forming, by itself, a term; but capable of forming part of one; in which case it is connected with the verb—whence its name; *e. g.* the sun *shines brightly*.

The syntax of the adverb is simpler than that of any other part of speech, excepting, perhaps, that of the adjective.

Adverbs have no concord.

Neither have they any government.

The position of an adverb is, in respect to matters of syntax, pre-eminently parenthetic; *i. e.* it may be omitted without injuring the construction. *He is fighting—now; he was fighting—then; he fights—bravely; I am—almost—tired, &c.*

By referring to the chapter on the Adjectives, we shall find that the neuter adjective is frequently converted into an adverb by deflection. As any neuter adjective may be so deflected, we may justify such expressions as *full* (for *fully*), *conspicuous* (for *conspicuously*), and *peculiar* (for *peculiarly*). We are not, however, bound to imitate everything that we can justify.

§ 598. The termination *-ly* was originally adjectival.

At present it is a derivational syllable by which we can convert an adjective into an adverb : *brave, bravely*. When, however, the adjective ends in *-ly* already, the formation is awkward. *I eat my daily bread* is unexceptionable English ; *I eat my bread daily* is exceptionable. One of two things must here take place : the two syllables *-ly* are packed into one (the full expression being *dai-li-ly*), or else the construction is that of a neuter adjective.

§ 599. It has been remarked, that in expressions like *he sleeps the sleep of the righteous*, the construction is adverbial. So it is in expressions like *he walked a mile, it weighs a pound*. The ideas expressed by *mile* and *pound* are not the names of anything that serves as either object or instrument to the verb. They only denote the *manner* of the action, and define the meaning of the verb.

§ 600. *From whence, from thence*.—This is an expression which, if it have not taken root in our language, is likely to do so. It is an instance of excess of expression in the way of syntax ; the *-ce* denoting direction *from* a place, and the preposition doing the same. It is not so important to determine what this construction *is*, as to suggest what it is *not*. It is *not* an instance of an adverb governed by a preposition. If the two words be dealt with as logically separate, *whence* (or *thence*) must be a noun = *which place* (or *that place*) ; just as *from then till now* = *from that time till this*. But if (which is the better view) the two words be dealt with as one (*i. e.* as an improper compound) the preposition *from* has lost its natural power and become the element of an adverb.

CHAPTER XIX.

SYNTAX OF PREPOSITIONS.

§ 601. ALL prepositions govern an oblique case. If a word fail to do this, it fails to be a preposition. In the first of the two following sentences the word *up* is a preposition, in the second an adverb.

1. *I climbed up the tree.*
2. *I climbed up.*

All prepositions in English precede the noun which they govern. *I climbed up the tree*, never *I climbed the tree up*. This is a matter not of government, but of collocation. The same, however, is the case in most languages; and, from the frequency of its occurrence, the term *pre-position* (or *prefix*) has originated. Nevertheless, it is by no means a philological necessity. In more languages than one the prepositions are *post-positive*, i. e. they follow their noun.

§ 602. No preposition, in the present English, governs a genitive case. This remark is made, because expressions like the *part of the body* = *pars corporis*,—*a piece of the bread* = *portio panis*, make it appear as if the preposition *of*, did so. The true expression is, that the preposition *of*, followed by an objective case, is equivalent, in many instances, to the genitive case of the classical languages.

§ 603. It is not so safe to say in the present English, that no preposition governs a dative. The expression *give it him* is good English; and it is also equivalent to the Latin *da ei*. But we may also say *give it to him*. Now the German *zu* = *to* governs a dative case, and in Anglo-Saxon, the preposition *to*, when prefixed to the infinitive mood, required the case that followed it to be a dative.

§ 604. When the infinitive mood is used as the subject

of a proposition, *i. e.* as a nominative case, we cannot allow to the preposition *to*, by which it is preceded, any separate existence whatever,—*to rise* = *rising*; *to err* = *error*. Here the preposition must, for the purposes of syntax, be considered as incorporated with the noun, just like an inseparable inflection. As such it may be preceded by another preposition. The following example, although a Grecism, illustrates this:—

Yet not to have been dipt in Lethe's lake,
Could save the son of Thetis *from to die*.

Akin to this, but not the same, is the so-called vulgarism, consisting of the use of the preposition *for*; as in *I am ready for to go*.

§ 605. Composition converts prepositions into adverbs. Whether we say *upstanding* or *standing-up*, we express the *manner* in which an action takes place, and not the relation between two substantives. The so-called prepositional compounds in Greek (*ἀναβαίνειν ἀποθνήσκω*, &c.) are all adverbial.

CHAPTER XX.

THE SYNTAX OF THE NEGATIVE.

§ 606. WHEN the verb is in the infinitive mood, the negative precedes it.—*Not to advance is to retreat*.

When the verb is not in the infinitive mood, the negative follows it—*He advanced not. I cannot*.

This rule is absolute. It only *seems* to precede the verb in such expressions as *I do not advance, I cannot advance, I have not advanced*, &c. However, the words *do*, *can*, and *have*, are no infinitives; and it consequently follows them. The word *advance* is an infinitive, and it

consequently precedes it. Wallis's rule makes an equivalent statement, although differently:—

Adverbium negandi *not* (non) verbo postponitur (nempe auxiliari primo si adsit; aut si non adsit auxiliare, verbo principali): aliis tamen orationis partibus præfigi solet.—P. 113.

That the negative is rarely used, except with the auxiliary *do*—in other words, that the presence of a negative converts a simple form like *it burneth not* into the circumlocution *it does not burn*—is a fact in the practice of the English language. The syntax is the same in either expression.

§ 607. What may be called the *distribution* of the negative is pretty regular in English. Thus, when the word *not* comes between an indicative, imperative, or subjunctive mood and an infinitive verb, it almost always is taken with the word which it follows—*I can not eat* may mean either *I can—not eat* (i. e. *I can abstain*), or *I can not—eat* (i. e. *I am unable to eat*); but, as stated above, it almost always has the latter signification.

But not *always*. In Byron's *Deformed Transformed* we find the following lines:—

Clay! not dead, but soulless,
Though no mortal man would choose thee,
An immortal no less
Deigns *not to refuse* thee.

Here *not to refuse* = *to accept*; and is probably a Grecism. *To not refuse* would, perhaps, be better.

The next expression is still more foreign to the English idiom:—

Yet *not to have been dipped* in Lethe's lake
Could save the son of Thetis from to die.

Here *not* is to be taken with *could*.

§ 608. In the present English, two negatives make an affirmative. *I have not not seen him* = *I have seen him*.

In Greek this was not the case. *Duæ aut plures negativæ apud Græcos vehementius negant* is a well-known rule. The Anglo-Saxon idiom differed from the English and coincided with the Greek. The French negative is only apparently double; words like *point*, *pas*, mean not *not*, but *at all*. *Je ne parle pas* = *I not speak at all*, not *I not speak no*.

§ 609. *Questions of appeal*.—All questions imply want of information; want of information may then imply doubt; doubt, perplexity; and perplexity the absence of an alternative. In this way, what are called *questions of appeal*, are, practically speaking, negatives. *What should I do?* when asked in extreme perplexity, means that nothing can well be done. In the following passage we have the presence of a question instead of a negative:—

Or hear'st thou (*cluis*, Lat.) rather pure ætherial stream
Whose fountain who (*no one*) shall tell?

Paradise Lost.

§ 610. The following extract* illustrates a curious and minute distinction, which the author shows to have been current when Wycliffe wrote, but which was becoming obsolete when Sir Thomas More wrote. It is an extract from that writer against Tyndall:—

“I would not here note by the way that Tyndall here translated *no* for *nay*, for it is but a trifle and mistaking of the Englishe worde: saving that ye shoulde see that he whych in two so plain Englishe wordes, and so common as in *aye* and *no* can not tell when he should take the one and when the tother, is not for translating into Englishe a man very mete. For the use of these two wordes in aunswering a question is this. *No* aunswereth the question framed by the affirmative. As for ensample if a manne should aske Tyndall himselfe: ys an heretike meete to translate Holy Scripture into Englishe? lo to thys question if he will aunswere trewe Englishe, he must aunswere *ay* and not *no*. But and if the question be asked hym thus lo: is not an heretike mete to translate Holy Scripture into Englishe? To this question if he will aunswere trewe Englishe, he must aunswere *no* and not *ay*. And a lyke difference is there betwene these two adverbs *ye* and *yes*. For if the question bee framed unto Tin-

* Philological Museum (vol. ii.).

dall by the affirmative in thys fashion: If an heretique falsely translate the New Testament into Englishe, to make his false heresyces seeme the word of Golde, be his bokes worthy to be burned? To this questyon asked in thys wyse, yf he will aunswere true Englishe, he must aunswere *ye* and not *yes*. But now if the question be asked him thus lo; by the negative: If an heretike falsely translate the Newe Testament into Englishe to make his false heresyces seme the word of God, be not hys bokes well worthy to be burned? To thys question in thys fashion framed if he will aunswere trewe Englishe, he may not aunswere *ye* but he must aunswere *yes*, and say, yes marry be they, bothe the translation and the translatour, and al that wyll hold wyth them."

CHAPTER XXI.

THE CASE ABSOLUTE.

§ 611. Nouns standing absolutely are of two sorts: (1.) Those originating in an accusative; (2.) those originating in a dative, case.

In expressing *distance* or *duration*, either in *time* or *space*, we use the noun absolutely; as *he walked ten miles* (*i. e. the space of ten miles*); *he stood three hours* (*i. e. the space of three hours*.) Here the words *stood* and *walk* are intransitive; so that it is not by them that the words *miles* and *hours* are governed. They stand absolutely. Although not distinguished in form from the nominative case, they are not nominatives. They are virtually accusatives; and when, in an older stage of the Gothic languages, the accusative *was* distinguished from the nominative, they appeared in the form of the accusative.

§ 612. *The door being open, the steed was stolen—the sun having arisen, the labourers proceeded to work.*—In these sentences, the words *door* and *sun* stand absolutely; and, as the words *being open*, and *having arisen*, agree with them, they, also, do the same. In English *substantives*, where there is no distinction between the nominative and the objective cases, it is of no practical importance to inquire as to the particular case in which

the words like *door* and *sun* stand. In the English *pronouns*, however, where there *is* a distinction between the nominative and objective cases, this inquiry must be made.

1. *He made the best proverbs of any one, him only excepted:*

2. *He made the best proverbs of any one, he only excepted.*

Which of these two expressions is correct? This we can decide only by determining in what case nouns standing absolutely in the way that *door*, *sun*, and *him* (or *he*), now stand, were found in that stage of our language when the nominative and objective cases were distinguished by separate forms. In Anglo-Saxon this case was the *dative*; as *up-a-sprungenre sunnan* = *the sun having arisen*. In Anglo-Saxon, also, *him* was a dative case, so that the case out of which expressions like the ones in question originated, was dative. Hence, of the two phrases, *him excepted* and *he excepted*, the former is the one which is *historically* correct. It is also the form which is *logically* correct. Almost all absolute expressions of this kind have a reference, more or less direct, to the *cause* of the action denoted. In sentences like *the stable door being open, the horse was stolen,—the sun having arisen the labourers got up to work*, this idea of either a cause, or a coincidence like a cause, is pretty clear.

In the sentence, *he made the best proverbs of any one, him only excepted*, the idea of cause is less plain. Still it exists. The existence of *him* (*i. e.* the particular person mentioned as pre-eminent in proverb-making) is the cause or reason why he (*i. e.* the person spoken of as the second-best proverb maker) was not the *very best* of proverb-makers. Now the practice of language in general teaches us this, *viz.* that where there is no proper Instrumental case, expressive of cause or agency, the Ablative is the case that generally supplies its place;

and where there is no Ablative, the Dative. Hence the Latins had their Ablative, the Anglo-Saxons their Dative, *Absolute. The Genitive Absolute in Greek is explicable upon other principles. In spite, however, both of history and logic, the so-called best authorities are in favour of the use of the Nominative case in the absolute construction.

In all absolute constructions of the kind in question one of the words is either a Substantive or a Pronoun, the other a *Participle*. The reason of this is in the fact of all such absolute constructions indicating either an *action* or a *state*.

EXAMPLE.

— only in destroying I find ease
 To my relentless thoughts, and *him destroyed*,
 Or won to what may work his utter loss
 For whom all this was made, all this will soon
 Follow. P. L. 9. 130.

Upon this Dr. Guest remarks—

Instead of this dative absolute, modern English writers generally give us the pronoun in the nominative. Bentley, in his edition of the *Paradise Lost*, corrects this syntax whenever he meets with it: for *I extinct*, 9. 629; *thou looking on*, 9. 312; *thou leading*, 10. 267; *he not found*, 10. 1001, &c.; he reads *me extinct*, *thee looking on*, *thee leading*, *him not found*, &c. His criticism was no doubt suggested by the laws of Latin grammar, but he would not have ventured upon it, had it not been borne out by contemporary English usage. The use indeed of the nominative, in these cases, does not admit of easy explanation. It is unknown to the older and purer dialects of our language, and probably originated in the use of the indeclinable pronoun, with which Milton was certainly acquainted.

CHAPTER XXII.

SYNTAX OF COMPLEX SENTENCES.

§ 613. Syntax deals with (1) the connection of words, and (2) the connection of propositions. The Syntax that deals with the connection of words, and the structure of

simple propositions has already come under notice. The Syntax that deals with the connection of propositions now commands attention. Attention, too, must be given to the word *connection*. It, by no means, follows that because we find a long list of propositions following each other, there is a connection between them. Like marbles in a bag, to use an old illustration, they may touch without cohering; having as little relation to each other, as so many different essays or chapters. This is the case with proverbs, riddles, and the like, where each sentence constitutes a whole. In ordinary composition, however, this extreme isolation is rare. In ordinary composition the chances are, that out of three propositions, the middle one will have a double relation; one with its predecessor, one with its follower. This relation, however, need not be grammatical.

Laying, then, out of our account those propositions, which, though they may stand in juxta-position with one another, have no *grammatical* connection, we come to the consideration of those sentences in which there is not only two (or more) propositions, but, also a connecting link between them: or, if not this, something in the nature of the one, which implies, or presupposes, the other. This is the case with questions and answers. But though questions and answers, along with a few other details of minor importance, come under this division of Syntax; they, by no means, constitute the most important part of it. The most important part of it is constituted by the Relative Pronouns and the Conjunctions. But it must be remembered that in the way of Etymology, the Relatives and the Interrogatives are identical.

This is one affinity. That of the Relative Pronouns with the Conjunction is equally clear. Though expressions like *the man as goes to market* instead of *the man who goes to market* are exceptionable, there is a reason for their having an existence. What they may be, belongs

to other investigations. At the present, we are looking for illustrations only. Nor are the most unexceptionable ones far off. The Latin language give us the relations of *quod* and *ut*, the Latin and Greek combined those of *ut* and *ὅτι*: with which we may compare our own *that*; a word which originally a Demonstrative Pronoun, is next a Relative, and, finally, a Conjunction.

1. *That* is right.
2. The man *that* has just left.
3. I fear *that* I shall be late.

Lastly, the Relative Pronouns and the Conjunction agree in this—they agree in introducing the Syntax of a new Mood—a Mood which is sometimes called the Conjunctive, sometimes the Subjunctive, and sometimes the Potential. Whatever we call it, it has this characteristic, viz. that *it can only exist in the second of two connected propositions, the connection between them being effected by either a Relative Pronoun or a Conjunctive*. Where neither of these exist, there is no Conjunctive, Subjunctive, or Potential Mood.

Such is a brief sketch of the reasons for considering the proposed divisions of our Syntax natural.

CHAPTER XXIII.

ON THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN.

§ 614. QUESTIONS are of two sorts, direct and oblique.

Direct.—Who is he ?

Oblique.—What do you say that he is ?

All difficulties about the cases of the interrogative pronoun may be determined by framing an answer, and observing the case of the word which gives it. This,

however, should be done by a pronoun ; as by so doing, we distinguish the accusative case from the nominative. If necessary, it should be made in full. Thus the full answer to *whom do you say that they seek ?* is, *I say that they seek him.*

DIRECT.

Qu. Who is this ?—Ans. I.

Qu. Whose is this ?—Ans. His.

Qu. Whom do you seek ?—Ans. Him.

OBLIQUE.

Qu. Who do you say that it is ?—Ans. He.

Qu. Whose do you say that it is ?—Ans. His.

Qu. Whom do you say that they seek ?—Ans. Him.

§ 615. Nevertheless, such expressions as *whom do they say that it is ?* are common, especially in oblique questions.

And he axed hem and seide, *whom* seien the people that I am ? Thei answeredn and seiden, Jon Baptist—and he seide to hem, But *whom* seien ye that I am ?—WYCLIFFE, Luke ix.

Tell me in sadness *whom* she is you love.

Romeo and Juliet, i. 1.

And as John fulfilled his course, he said, *whom* think ye that I am ?—

Acts xiii. 25.

This confusion, however, is exceptionable.

§ 616. When the Copula precedes the Predicate, the question is Categorical, and its answer is *Yes* or *No*.—
Question. *Is John at home ?* Answer. *Yes* or *no* as the case may be.

When the Predicate precedes the Copula the question is Indefinite, and the answer may be anything whatever. To *where is John ?* we may answer *at home, abroad, in the garden, in London, I do not know, &c., &c.*

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE RELATIVE PRONOUNS.

§ 617. It is necessary that the relative be in the same *gender* as the antecedent. It is necessary that the relative be in the same *number* as the antecedent. It is *not* necessary that the relative be in the same *case* with the antecedent.

1. John, *who* trusts me, comes here.
2. John, *whom* I trust, comes here.
3. John, *whose* confidence I possess, comes here.
4. I trust John, *who* trusts me.

The reason why the relative must agree with its antecedent in both number and gender, whilst it need not agree with it in case, is found in the following observations.

1. All sentences containing a relative contain two verbs—*John who* (1) *trusts me* (2) *comes here*.

2. Two verbs express two actions—(1) *trust*, (2) *come*.

3. Whilst, however, the actions are two in number, the person or thing which does, or suffers, them is single—*John*.

4. *He* (*she* or *it*) is singular, *ex vi termini*. The relative expresses the *identity* between the subjects (or objects) of the two actions. Thus *who* = *John*, or is another name for John.

5. Things and persons that are one and the same, are of one and the same gender. The *John* *who trusts* is necessarily of the same gender with the *John* *who comes*.

6. Things and persons that are one and the same, are of one and the same number. The number of *Johns* *who trust*, is the same as the number of *Johns* *who come*. Both these elements of concord are immutable.

7. But a third element of concord is not immutable. The person or thing that is an agent in the one part of

the sentence, may be the object of an action in the other. The *John* whom I *trust* may *trust* me also. Hence—

(a) I trust John—*John* the object.

(b) John trusts me—*John* the agent.

As the relative is only the antecedent in another form, it may change its case according to the construction.

(1) I trust John—(2) *John* trusts me.

(1) I trust John—(2) *He* trusts me.

(1) I trust John—(2) *Who* trusts me.

(1) John trusts me—(2) I trust *John*.

(1) John trusts me—(2) I trust *him*.

(1) John trusts me—(2) I trust *whom*.

(1) John trusts me—(2) *Whom* I trust.

(1) John—(2) *Whom* I trust—(1) trusts me.

618. (1.) *The books I want are here.*—This is a specimen of a true ellipsis. In all such phrases in *full*, there are *three* essential elements; (1.) the first proposition; as *the books are here*; (2.) the second proposition; as *I want*; (3.) the connecting link—here wanting.

§ 619. When there are two words in a clause, each of which is capable of being an antecedent, the relative refers to the latter.—*Solomon the son of David who slew Goliath* is unexceptionable. Not so, however, *Solomon the son of David who built the temple*. So far as the latter expression is defensible it is defensible on the ground that *Solomon-the-son-of-David* is a single many-worded name.

§ 620. Should we say *it is I, your master, who command*, or *it is I, your master, who commands you*?—The sentence contains two propositions.

It is I.

Who commands you.

where the word *master* is (so to say) undistributed. It may belong to either clause of the sentence, *i. e.* the whole sentence may be divided into either—

It is I your master—

OR

Your master who commands you.

This is the first point to observe. The next is, that the verb in the second clause is governed not by either the personal pronoun or the substantive, but by the relative *who*.

And this brings us to the following question:—with which of the two antecedents does the *relative* agree? with *I* or with *master*?

This may be answered by saying that :

1. When two antecedents are in the same proposition, the relative agrees with the first. Thus—

It is *I* your *master*—
Who *command* you.

2. When two antecedents are in different propositions, the relative agrees with the second. Thus—

1. It is *I*—
2. Your *master* who *commands* you.

This, however, is not all. What determines whether the two antecedents shall be the same or in different propositions? I believe that the following rules for what may be called *the distribution of the substantive antecedent* will bear criticism.

1. When there is any natural connection between the substantive antecedent and the verb governed by the relative, the antecedent belongs to the second clause. Thus, in the expression just quoted, the word *master* is logically connected with the word *command*; and this fact makes the expression, *It is I, your master, who commands you*, the better of the two.

2. When there is no natural connection between the substantive antecedent and the verb governed by the relative, the antecedent belongs to the first clause. *It is I, John, who command* (not *commands*) *you*.

To recapitulate, the train of reasoning has been as follows:—

1. The person of the second verb is the person of the relative.

2. The person of the relative is that of one of two antecedents.

3. Of such two antecedents the relative agrees with the one which stands in the same proposition with itself.

4. Which position is determined by the connection or want of connection between the substantive antecedent and the verb governed by the relative.

The relations of the Relative Pronoun to the Subjunctive will be considered after the Syntax of the Conjunctions has been exhibited.

NOTE.

I am not sure that this is the true doctrine. I let it stand, however, because it gives a true distinction. It may be better, however, to hold that ordinary substantives like *master* and *John*, instead of being, as is generally held, of the third person, are of the person of the pronoun with which they stand in apposition, and that they are only of the third person when they stand alone, or with *he*, *she*, or *it* before them. They are, however, so often in this predicament that it not only seems as if they were so essentially; but it is somewhat difficult to conceive them otherwise. However, if the doctrine of this note be true, *master*, as long as it is in apposition with *I*, is of the same person as *I*. And so is *John*. If so, expressions like *it is I, your master, who commands you*, are only *excusable*—excusable on the ground of the apposition being, to some extent, concealed.

CHAPTER XXV.

THE SYNTAX OF CONJUNCTIONS.

§ 621. NOTWITHSTANDING their apparent unimportance, few parts of speech require closer consideration than the Conjunctions. The logical view of their character is instructive. Their history is equally interesting and clear. Finally, above all other parts of speech, they exhibit the phenomenon of convertibility. Nor is this doctrine as to their importance new; although, in the present work,

where the division of Syntax into that of the simple and that of the complex proposition is insisted on, they may, on a superficial view, appear to take undue prominence. In all grammars, however, they are important: although in some their importance is disguised. Both the Latin and the Greek philologues write largely upon the syntax of the Subjunctive Mood; and, it cannot be added, that what they thus write is either the easiest or the most fascinating portion of the works wherein it appears. It appertains, however, to the department of Mood, and, so doing, comes under the notice of the Verb. Yet where is there a Subjunctive Mood without either a conjunction or a Relative Pronoun? I do not say that this distribution of the functions of the Conjunctions is wrong. I only say that it disguises much of their character. That the Syntax of a certain Mood, whether Subjunctive or Conjunctive, depends, largely, upon Conjunctions is clear.

§ 622. Conjunctions connect Terms. Sometimes the terms these connect lie in one and the same proposition—as, *all men are black or white*. Sometimes they lie in different ones, as—

*The day is bright
because
The sun shines.*

Of these two connections the former is so scarce that it needs only to be noticed. The latter is proportionally common. Practically speaking, it gives us ninety-nine hundredths of our Syntax. This enables us to treat Conjunctions as if they connected Propositions only. At any rate, nearly all our rules apply to such as do so.

§ 623. To know the number and nature of all possible Conjunctions we must know all the different ways in which two propositions can be related to one another. Thus, the sun may shine, and the heat of the weather may result from its so doing. In such a case the two pro-

positions (1) *the weather is hot* and (2) *the sun shines* are linked together as cause and effect. But this union is double; inasmuch as we may infer the cause from the effect or the effect from the cause; saying, in the first case,—

*The weather is hot
because*

The sun shines ;

and, in the second,

*The sun shines,
therefore*

The weather is hot.

Again, of two propositions one may contain an objection to the other ; as

*The weather is warm to-day,
but*

It will not be so to-morrow ;

or, one proposition may announce an act, and the intention with which it was done : as

*I do this
that*

I may succeed.

There are several such relations, and several such links that connect them. The number, however, is, by no means, great ; neither has it been uninvestigated. On the contrary, the Conjunctions have been classified, and named—those that connect causes and effects having one name, those that imply objections another—and so on.

EXAMPLES.

*I am pleased,
because*

*This has happened ;
but*

*I should have been disappointed,
if*

*It had fallen out otherwise.
and*

*I think
that,*

Even now, some of my real
or
Supposed friends will be more surprised
than
Satisfied with the arrangement.

§ 624. Conjunctions which connect two or more Terms are called Copulative; as *and*.

Conjunctions which connect one of two Terms are called Disjunctive; as *or*. Disjunctives are either true Disjunctives or Subdisjunctives. A true Disjunctive separates *things*. When we say *the sun or the moon is shining*, we separate two different objects, one of which shines by day, the other by night. Subdisjunctives separate *names*. When we say *Victoria, or the Queen of England, is our sovereign*, we speak of the same object, under different names.

§ 625. The idea expressed by a Copulative may be strengthened and made clearer by the addition of the words *each, both, all*, or the like. Thus, we may say *both sun and moon are shining*, and *Venus, Jupiter, and the Dogstar are all visible*.

The idea expressed by a Disjunctive may be strengthened and made clearer by the addition of *either*. We may say, *either, the sun or the moon, is shining*.

The idea expressed by a Subdisjunctive may be strengthened and made clearer by the phrase *in other words*. We may say *Queen Victoria, in other words, the Queen of England, &c.*

In all these cases, the words *both, &c., either, &c., and in other words, &c.*, are no true Conjunctions. They strengthen the Conjunction. The Conjunction, however, exists without them.

§ 626. *Or* and *either* have their corresponding Negatives—*nor* and *neither*. *I will either come or send is right*. So is *I will neither come nor send*. But *I will*

neither come or send is wrong. When a question is either asked or implied, *whether* takes the place of *either*. Words like *either*, &c., are generally treated as Conjunctions. This, however, they are not. The most that can be said of them is, that they form part of certain Conjunctional expressions. They never stand alone. Meanwhile, the words with which they correspond can, as a general rule, do without them. We say *this or that*, *mine or his*, quite as correctly as *either this or that*, *neither mine nor his*. If, then, they are not conjunctions, what are they? *Both* is decidedly a Pronoun. *Either*, however, *neither* and *whether*, seem to be both Pronouns and Adverbs. When *either* means *one out of two*, it is a Pronoun. When it means *in the way of an alternative*, it is an Adverb.

§ 627. Other Conjunctions are Causal, Illative, Final, and Conditional.

Causals give the cause of a given effect.

*The day is warm
because
The sun shines.*

Illatives give the effect of a given cause.

*The sun shines,
therefore
The day is warm.*

Finals give the object for which a given action is effected.

*I do this
that
You may follow my example.*

Conditional—

*The night will be fine
if
the stars shine.*

Than implies Comparison. *But* is Adversative.

§ 628. The Syntax of the Causals and Illatives re-

quires no special notice. Not so, that of the (1) Copulatives, (2) Disjunctives, (3) Comparatives, (4) Adversatives ; and, above all, the Conditionals.

§. 629. *And, in such expressions as the sun and moon shine.*—As a general rule, the Copulative Conjunctions give compendiums of the sort in question. Copulatives require the Plural, Disjunctives the Singular, number.

§ 630. *The concord of persons.*—A difficulty that occurs frequently in the Latin language is rare in English. In expressions like *ego et ille*, followed by a verb, there arises a question as to the person in which that verb shall be used. Is it to be in the first person in order to agree with *ego*, or in the *third* in order to agree with *ille* ? For the sake of laying down a rule upon these and similar points, the classical grammarians arrange the persons (as they do the genders) according to their *dignity*, making the word agree with the most *worthy*. In respect to persons, the first is more worthy than the second, and the second more worthy than the third. Hence, they said—

Ego et Balbus sustulimus manus.
Tu et Balbus sustulistis manus.

Now, in English, the plural form is the same for all three persons. Hence we say *I and you are friends, you and I are friends, I and he are friends*, &c., so that, for the practice of language, the question as to the relative dignity of the three persons is a matter of indifference. Nevertheless, it *may* occur even in English. Whenever two or more pronouns of different persons, and of the *singular* number, follow each other *disjunctively*, the question of concord arises. *I or you,—you or he,—he or I.* I believe that, in these cases, the rule is as follows :—

1. Whenever the word *either* or *neither* precedes the pronouns, the verb is in the third person. *Either*

you or I is in the wrong—neither you nor I is in the wrong.

2. Whenever the disjunctive is simple (*i. e.* unaccompanied with the word *either* or *neither*) the verb agrees with the *first* of the two pronouns.

I or he am in the wrong.

He or I is in the wrong.

Thou or he art in the wrong.

He or thou is in the wrong.

§ 631. The Syntax of *that* gives what is called the *succession of tenses*. Whenever it expresses intention, and, consequently, connects two verbs, the second of which denotes an act which takes place *after* the first, the verbs in question must be in the same tense.

I do this that I may gain by it.

I did this that I might gain by it.

In the Greek language this is expressed by a difference of mood; the subjunctive being the construction equivalent to *may*, the optative to *might*. The Latin idiom coincides with the English. A little consideration will show that this rule is absolute. For a man *to be doing* one action (in present time) in order that some other action may *follow* it (in past time) is to reverse the order of cause and effect. To do anything in A.D. 1851, that something may result from it in 1850 is a contradiction; and so it is to say *I do this that I might gain by it*. The reasons against the converse construction are nearly, if not equally, cogent. To have done anything at any *previous* time in order that a *present* effect may follow, is, *ipso facto*, to convert a past act into a present one, or, to speak in the language of the grammarian, to convert an aorist into a perfect. To say *I did this that I may gain by it*, is to make, by the very effect of the expression, either *may* equivalent to *might*, or *did* equivalent to *have done*.

I did this that I might gain.

I have done this that I may gain.

§ 632. No conjunction can govern a case. A word that governs a case, be it ever so like a conjunction, is no conjunction, but a preposition. *Than* follows adjectives and adverbs of the comparative degree. *This is sharper than that. I see better to-day than yesterday.*

Than, in respect to its etymology, is neither more nor less than *then*. It is not difficult to see the connection in sense between such sentences as, *I like this better than I like that*, and *I like this—than (afterwards or next in order) I like that*.

Than is sometimes treated as a preposition when it governs a case.

Thou art a girl as much brighter than *her*,

As he is a poet sublimer than *me*.—PRIOR.

You are a much greater loser than *me*.—SWIFT.

It is better, however, to treat it as a conjunction, in which case the noun which follows it depends upon the verb of the antecedent clause. 1. *I like you better than he* = *I like you better than he likes you*. 2. *I like you better than him* = *I like you better than I like him*.

§ 633. *But*, in respect to its etymology, is *be-utan* = *be-out*. It is not difficult to see the connection in sense between such sentences as *all but one*, and *all without (or except) one*.

But, then, is a Preposition and an Adverb, as well as a Conjunction. Prepositional construction.—*They all ran away but me*, i. e. *except me*. Conjunctional Construction.—*They all ran away but I*, i. e. *but I did not run away*.

§ 634. Conditional Conjunctions govern the Subjunctive Mood.

The chief Conditional Subjunctive is *if*. To say *if the sun shines the day will be clear* is inaccurate. The proper expression is, *if the sun shine, &c.*

Although the word *if* is the type and specimen of the conditional conjunction, there are several others so closely related to it in meaning as to agree with it in requiring a subjunctive mood to follow them.

1. *Except* I be by Silvia in the night,
There is no music in the nightingale.
2. Let us go and sacrifice to the Lord our God *lest* he *fall* upon us with pestilence.
3. Let him not go *lest* he *die*.
4. He shall not eat of the holy thing *unless* he *wash* his flesh with water.
5. *Although* my house *be* not so with God.
6. —revenge back on itself recoils.
Let it. I reck not *so* it *light* well aimed.
7. Seek out his wickedness *till* thou *find* none.

And so on with *before*, *ere*, *as long as*.

§ 635. On the other hand, *if* itself is not *always* conditional; conditional conjunctions being of two sorts:—

1. Those which express a condition as an actual fact, and one admitted as such by the speaker:

2. Those which express a condition as a possible fact, and one which the speaker either does not admit, or admits only in a qualified manner.

Since *the children are so badly brought up*, &c.—This is an instance of the first construction. The speaker admits, as an actual fact, the *bad bringing-up of the children*.

If *the children be so badly brought-up*, &c.—This is an instance of the second. The speaker admits as a possible (perhaps, as a probable) fact the *bad bringing-up of the children*; but he does not adopt it as an indubitable one.

Now, if every conjunction had a fixed unvariable meaning, there would be no difficulty in determining whether a condition were absolute and beyond doubt, or possible and liable to doubt. But such is not the case.

Although may precede a proposition which is admitted as well as one which is doubted.

(a) *Although the children are, &c.*

(b) *Although the children be, &c.*

If, too, may precede propositions wherein there is no doubt whatever implied: in other words, it may be used instead of *since*.

Hence we must look to the meaning of the sentence in general, rather than to the particular conjunction used.

It is a philological fact, that *if* may stand instead of *since*.

It is also a philological fact, that when it does so, it should be followed by the indicative mood.

As a point of practice, the following method of determining the amount of doubt expressed in a conditional proposition is useful:—Insert, immediately after the conjunction, one of the two following phrases—(1) *as is the case*; (2) *as may or may not be the case*. By ascertaining which of these two supplements expresses the meaning of the speaker, we ascertain the mood of the verb which follows.

When the first formula is the one required, there is no element of doubt, and the verb should be in the indicative mood. *If (as is the case) he is gone, I must follow him.*

When the second formula is the one required, there is an element of doubt, and the verb should be in the subjunctive mood. *If (as may or may not be the case) he be gone, I must follow him.*

§ 636. Between the relative pronouns and conjunctions in general there is this point of connection,—both join propositions. Wherever there is a relative, there is a second proposition. So there is, for the most part, wherever there is a conjunction.

Between certain relative pronouns and those particular conjunctions that govern a subjunctive mood there is also a point of connection. Both suggest an element of uncertainty or indefinitude. This the relative pronouns do, through the logical elements common to them and to the interrogatives: these latter essentially suggesting the idea of doubt. Wherever the person, or thing, connected with an action, and expressed by a relative is indefinite, there is room for the use of a subjunctive mood. Thus—"he that troubled you shall bear his judgment, *whosoever* he *be*."

By considering the nature of such words as *when*, their origin as relatives on the one hand, and their conjunctive character on the other hand, we are prepared for finding a relative element in words like *till*, *until*, *before*, *as long as*, &c. These can all be expanded into expressions like *until the time when*, *during the time when*, &c. Hence, in an expression like *seek out his wickedness till thou find (not findest) none*, the principle of the construction is nearly the same as in *he that troubled you*, &c., or *vice versâ*.*

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE RECIPROCAL CONSTRUCTION.

§ 637. IN all sentences containing the statement of a reciprocal or mutual action there are in reality two assertions, one that A. *strikes* (or *loves*) B.; and another that B. *strikes* (or *loves*) A. Hence, if the expressions exactly

* Notwithstanding the extent to which a relative may take the appearance of a conjunction, there is always one unequivocal method of deciding its true nature. The relative is always a *part* of the second proposition. A conjunction is no *part* of either.

coincided with the fact signified, there would always be two full propositions. This, however, is not the habit of language. Hence arises a more compendious form of expression, giving origin to an ellipsis of a peculiar kind. Phrases like *Eteocles and Polynices killed each other* are elliptical, for *Eteocles and Polynices killed—each the other*. Here the second proposition expands and explains the first, whilst the first supplies the verb to the second. Each, however, is elliptic. The first is without the object, the second without the verb. That the verb must be in the plural number, that one of the nouns must be in the nominative case, and the other in the objective, is self-evident from the structure of the sentence.

§ 638. This is the syntax. As to the power of the words *each* and *one*, I am not prepared to say that in the common practice of the English language there is any distinction between them. A distinction, however, if it existed, would give strength to our language. Where *two* persons performed a reciprocal action, the expression might be, *one another*; as, *Eteocles and Polynices killed one another*. Where *more than two* persons were engaged on each side of a reciprocal action the expression might be *each other*; as, *the ten champions praised each other*. This amount of perspicuity is attained, by different processes, in the French, Spanish, and Scandinavian languages.

(1.) French.—*Ils* (i. e. A. and B.) *se battaient—l'un l'autre*. *Ils* (A. B. C.) *se battaient—les uns les autres*.

(2.) In Spanish, *uno otro* = *l'un l'autre*, and *unos otros* = *les uns les autres*.

(3.) Danish.—*Hinander* = the French *l'un l'autre*; whilst *hverandre* = *les uns les autres*.

APPENDIX.

PART I.

1. What are the *present* languages of Wales, the Isle of Man, the Scotch Highlands, and Ireland?

2. What are the *present* languages of Germany and Holland? How are they related to the *present* language of England? How to the original language of England?

3. Enumerate the chief *supposed* migrations from Germany to England, giving (when possible) the *date* of each, the particular German tribe by which each was undertaken, and the parts of Great Britain whereon the different landings were made. Why do I say *supposed* migrations? Criticize, in detail, the evidence by which they are supported, and state the extent to which it is exceptionable. Who was Beda? What were the sources of his information?

4. Give reasons for believing in the existence of Germans in England anterior to A.D. 449. Enumerate the chief Germanic populations connected by ancient writers with the *Angles*, stating the ethnological relations of each, and noticing the extent to which they coincide with those of the *Angles*.

5. Who are the present Jutlanders of Jutland? Who the inhabitants of the district called Anglen in Sleswick? What are the reasons for connecting these with the Jutes and Angles of Beda? What those for denying such a connection?

6. What is the meaning of the termination *-uarii* in *Cant-uarii* and *Vect-uarii*? What was the Anglo-Saxon translation of *Antiqui Saxones*, *Occidentales Saxones*, *Orientalis Saxones*, *Meridionales Saxones*?

7. Translate *Cantware* and *Wihthware* into Latin. How does Alfred translate *Jutæ*? How does the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle?

What is the derivation of the name *Carisbrook*, a town in the Isle of Wight?

• 8. Take exception to the opinion that *Jutes*, from *Jutland*, formed part of the German invasion of England; or, rather, take exception to the evidence upon which that opinion is based.

9. From what part of Germany were the *Angles* derived? What is Beda's statement concerning them?

10. What is the latest date for the introduction of the English language into England? Give the approximate date of the *Notitia*. What was the *Littus Saxonicum*? What were the *Lati*?

11. Give the localities of the Old-Saxons, and the Northalbingians. Investigate the area occupied by the Anglo-Saxons.

12. What is the present population of the Dutch province of Friesland? What its language? What the dialects and stages of that language?

13. What was the language of the *Asega-bog*, the *Heliand*, *Beowulf*, *Hildubrand* and *Hathubrant*, the Carolinian Psalms, the Gospels of *Ulphilas*, and the poems of *Gysbert Japicx*?

14. Make a map of Ancient Germany and Scandinavia according to the languages and dialects of those two areas. Exhibit, in a tabular form, the languages akin to the English.

15. Analyze the Scandinavian forms *solen*, *bordet*, and *brennast*.

16. Exhibit the difference between the *logical* and the *historical* analysis of a language.

17. What are the Keltic words in the English language?

18. What are the reasons for believing that there is a *Frisian* element in the population of England?

19. What are the languages enumerated by Beda as being spoken in England? What the *Latin* of that writer?

20. Criticize the statements of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle concerning *Port*, *Wiktgar*, and *Cissa*.

21. What was the *pagus Hessi Franconicus*? What the meaning of the word *Lathe*?

22. Exhibit, in a tabular form, the languages and dialects of the Classical stock.

23. What is the bearing of the statements of Tacitus and other ancient writers respecting the chief German populations allied to the Angles?

24. Translate the words *bæo*, *botl*, *fleot*, *hyrst*, *worðig*.

25. Exhibit the different forms of *hām*, and the different meanings of *f-rd*. Trace the distribution of them.

26. Enumerate the chief periods during which words from the Latin were introduced into English, and classify the Latin elements accordingly.

27. What words were introduced *directly* by the Danes, Scandinavians, or Norsemen? What *indirectly*? Through what language did these latter come?

28. Give the languages from whence the following words were introduced into the English—*flannel*, *jerked* (as *beef*), *hammock*, *apparatus*, *waltz*, *seraph*, *plaid*, *street*, *muslin*.

29. Distinguish between the *direct*, *indirect*, and *ultimate* origin of introduced words. What words have we in English which are supposed to have *originated* in the Ancient Ægyptian, the Syrian, and the languages of Asia Minor?

30. Under what different forms do the following words appear in English—*monasterium*, *πρεσβύτερος*, *ἐπισκοπος*? Account for these differences. *Syrup*, *shrub*, and *sherbet*, all originate from the same word. Explain the present difference.

31. Give the *direct* origin (i. e. the languages from which they were *immediately* introduced) of—*Druid*, *epistle*, *chivalry*, *cyder*, *mæander*. Give the *indirect* origin of the same.

32. Investigate the process by which a word like *sparrow-grass*, apparently of *English* origin, is, in reality, derived from the Latin word *asparagus*.

33. Point out the incorrectness in the words *frontispiece*, *colleague*, and *lanthorn*.

34. To what extent may *Norse*, and to what extent may *Keltic* words, not found in the current language of English, be found in the provincial dialects? What were the original names of the towns *Whitby* and *Derby*? From what language are the present names derived? Give the reason for your answer.

35. Show the extent to which the *logical* and *historical* analysis coincide in respect to the words introduced from the Roman of the second period, the Arabic, the Anglo-Norman, and the Keltic of the current English.

36. What are the plural forms of *criterion*, *axis*, *genius*, *index*, *dogma*? When is a word introduced from a foreign language *perfectly*, when *imperfectly* incorporated with the language into which it is imported? Is the following expression correct—the *cherubim that singeth aloft*? If not, why?

37. What is there exceptionable in the words *semaphore* (mean-

ing a sort of telegraph), and *witticism*? Give the etymologies of the words *icicle*, *radicle*, and *radical*. What are the singular forms of *cantharides*, *phenomena*, and *data*?

38. What are the stages of the English language?
 39. Express in general terms the chief points wherein a modern language differs from an ancient one: or rather, the points wherein the different stages of the same language differ.

PARTS II. AND III.

1. Explain the terms *sonant*, *explosive*, *aspirate*, *vowel*, *mute*, *asperate*.
2. Exhibit the difference between the quantity of *syllables*, and the quantity of *vowels*.
3. Accentuate the following words,—*attribute* (adjective), *surrey* (verb), *August* (the month).
4. Under what conditions is the *sound* of consonants doubled?
5. Exhibit, in a tabular form, the system of the mutes, underlining those which do not occur in English.
6. What is the power of *ph* in *Philip*? what in *haphazard*? Illustrate the difference fully.
7. Investigate the changes by which the words *picture*, *nature*, derived from the Latin *pictura* and *natura*, are *sounded* *pictshur* and *natshur*.
8. How do you sound the combination *apd*? Why?
9. In what points is the English alphabet *insufficient*, *redundant*, and *inconsistent*?
10. Give the metrical notation of the *Ballad Stanza*, *Service Metre*, *Common Octosyllabics*, and *Elegiacs*.

PART IV.

1. Explain the difference between *composite* and *de-composite* words, *true* and *improper compounds*. Analyze the word *nightingale*.
2. How far are the following words instances of gender—*boy*, *he-goat*, *actress*, *which*? Analyze the forms *what*, *her*, *its*, *vizen*, *spinster*, *gander*, *drake*.
3. What is the power (real or supposed) of the *-er* in *over* and in *either*?

4. What words in the present English are explained by the following forms—*sutiza*, in Mæso-Gothic, and *scearpor*, *neah*, *gylde*, in Anglo-Saxon? Explain the forms *better*, *worse*, *more*, *less*.

5. Analyze the words *former*, *next*, *upmost*, *thirty*, *streamlet*, *sweetheart*, *duckling*.

6. Translate *Ida was Eopping*. Analyze the word *Wales*.

7. Exhibit the extent to which the noun partakes of the character of the verb, and *vice versâ*. What were the Anglo-Saxon forms of *I can call*, *I begin to call*?

8. How far is there a dual number in the tongues allied to the English? What is the rule for forming such a plural as *stags* from *stag*? What are the peculiarities in *monarchs*, *cargoes*, *keys*, *pence*, *geese*, *children*, *women*, *houses*, *paths*, *leaves*? Of what number are the words *alms*, *physics*, *news*, *riches*?

9. To what extent have we in English a dative, an accusative, and instrumental case? Disprove the doctrine that the genitive in *-s* (*the father's son*) is formed out of the combination *father his*.

10. Decline *me*, *thee*, and *ye*.

11. How far is there a true reflective pronoun in English?

12. What were the original powers and forms of *she*, *her*, *it*? What case is *him*? What is the power and origin of *the* in such expressions as *all the more*? Decline *he* in Anglo-Saxon. Investigate the forms *these* and *those*, *whose*, *what*, *whom*, *which*, *myself*, *himself*, *herself*, *such*, *every*.

13. Investigate the forms *drench*, *raise*, *use* (the verb), *clothe*.

14. *Thou speakest*. What is the peculiarity of the form?

15. *Thou runnest* (= *tu cucurristi*). Is this an unexceptionable form? if not, why?

16. What are the *moods* in English? What the *tenses*? How far is the division of verbs into Weak and Strong natural? Account for the double forms *swam* and *swum*. Enumerate the other verbs in the same class. Explain the forms *taught*, *wrought*, *aught*, *did* (from *do* = *facio*), *did* (from *do* = *valeo*), *minded*.

17. Define the term *irregular*, so as to raise the number of Irregular verbs in English, to more than a hundred. Define the same term, so as to reduce them to none. Explain the form *could*.

18. Illustrate the *future* power of *be*. *Werden* in Germany means *become*—in what form does the word appear in English?

19. *To err is human*,—*the rising* in the North. Explain these constructions. Account for the second *-r* in *forlorn*; and for the *y* in *y-cleped*.

20. How far are adverbs inflected? Distinguish between a *preposition* and a *conjunction*.
21. Explain the forms *there*, *thence*, *yonder*, and *anon*.
22. What part of speech is *mine*?
23. What is the probable origin of the *-d* in such præterites as *call-ed*?

PART V.

1. Explain the terms *Syntax*, *Ellipsis*, *Pleonasm*, *Zeugma*, *Pros-to-smainomenon*, *Apposition*, and *Convertibility*, giving examples of each.
2. What is the Government of Adjectives?
3. What is the construction in—
 - (a) Rob *me* the Exchequer.
 - (b) Mount *ye* on horseback.
 - (c) *His* mother.
 - (d) If the salt have lost *his* savour.
 - (e) Myself *is* weak.
 - (f) This *is mine*.
4. What is the difference between—
 - (a) *The* secretary and treasurer,
and
 - (b) *The* secretary and *the* treasurer?
 What is that between—
 The first two,
 and
 The two first?
5. What is the construction of—
 He sleeps the sleep of the righteous?
6. Whether do you say—It is I your master who *command* you,
 or, It is I your master who *commands* you?
7. Explain in full the following constructions—
 - (a) I have ridden a horse.
 - (b) I am to blame.
 - (c) I am beaten.
 - (d) A part of the body.
 - (e) All fled but John.
8. What is meant by the *Succession of Tenses*? Show the logical necessity of it.

9. Or *hear'st* thou rather pure ethereal stream,

Whose fountain *who can* tell?—MILTON.

Give the meaning of this passage, and explain the figure of speech exhibited in the words in *Italics*.

10. The *door* being open the steed was stolen. In what case is *door*?

11. What are the concords between the relative and the antecedent? How far is, *whom* do they say that I am, an exceptionable expression?

12. *Eteocles and Polynices killed each other.* What is the construction here? *Ils se battaient, l'un l'autre— Ils se battaient, les uns les autres.* Translate these two sentences into English *My wife and little ones are well.* What is the origin of the word *ones* here? *It was those who spoke. There was those who spoke.* Why is one of those expressions correct, the other incorrect?

THE END.

EDUCATIONAL WORKS

PRINTED FOR

WALTON AND MABERLY.

ENGLISH.

Dr. R. G. Latham. *The English Language. A New Edition.*

Complete in one volume. 8vo. 18s. cloth.

Latham's *Elementary English Grammar, for the Use of Schools.* Eighteenth thousand. With Chapters on Parsing and Punctuation, also Exercises and Questions for Examination. Small 8vo. 4s. 6d. cloth.

Latham's *Hand-book of the English Language, for the Use of Students of the Universities and higher Classes of Schools.* Fifth Edition. Small 8vo. 7s. 6d. cloth.

Latham's *Smaller English Grammar for the Use of Schools.*

By DR. R. G. LATHAM and Miss M. C. MABERLY. 2nd Ed. Fcap. 8vo., 2s. 6d. cloth.

Latham's *English Grammar for Classical Schools.* Third Edition. Revised and enlarged. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth.

Latham's *Logic in its Application to Language.*

12mo. 6s. cloth.

Mason's *English Grammar ; including the Principles of Grammatical Analysis.* 12mo. Second Edition. 2s. 6d.

Mason's *Grammatical Analysis of Sentences.* 12mo. 1s. 6d.

Mason's *First Steps in English Grammar for Junior Classes.* 18mo. 1s. cloth.

Mason's *Milton's Paradise Lost. Books 1 and 2, with Notes on the Analysis and Parsing.* Crown 8vo. each 2s., cloth.

Mason's *Thomson's Seasons, Part 1. "Spring," with Notes on the Analysis and Parsing, and a Life of Thomson.* Crown 8vo. 2s., cloth.

Abbott's *First English Reader.*

Third Edition. 12mo., with Illustrations. 1s. cloth, limp.

Abbott's *Second English Reader.*

Third Edition. 12mo. 1s. 6d. cloth, limp.

COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY.

Latham's *Elements of Comparative Philology.*

1 vol. 8vo. £1 1s.

GREEK.

The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament.

Third Edition. Royal 8vo. £2 2s.

Greenwood's *Greek Grammar, including Accidence, Irregular Verbs, and Principles of Derivation and Composition; adapted to the System of Crude Forms.* Small 8vo. 5s. 6d. cloth.

Kühner's New Greek Delectus; being Sentences for Translation from Greek into English, and English into Greek; arranged in a systematic Progression. By the late DR. ALEXANDER ALLEN. Seventh Edition. 12mo. 4s.

Gillespie's Greek Testament Roots, in a Selection of Texts, giving the power of Reading the whole Greek Testament without difficulty. With Grammatical Notes, and a Parsing Lexicon associating the Greek Primitives with English Derivatives. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d. cloth.

Robson's Constructive Exercises for Teaching the Elements of the Greek Language, on a system of Analysis and Synthesis, with Greek Reading Lessons and copious Vocabularies. 12mo., pp. 408. 7s. 6d. cloth.

Robson's First Greek Book. Exercises and Reading Lessons with Copious Vocabularies. Being the First Part of the "Constructive Greek Exercises." 12mo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

The London Greek Grammar. Designed to exhibit, in small Compass, the Elements of the Greek Language. Sixth Edition. 12mo. 1s. 6d.

Smith's Plato. The Apology of Socrates, the Crito, and part of the PHAEDO; with Notes in English from Stallbaum, Schleiermacher's Introductions, etc. Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH, Editor of the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, &c. Fourth Edition. 12mo. 5s. cloth.

Hardy and Adams's Anabasis of Xenophon. Expressly for Schools. With Notes, Index of Names, and a Map. 12mo. 4s. 6d. cloth.

LATIN.

New Latin Reading Book; consisting of Short Sentences, Easy Narrations, and Descriptions, selected from Caesar's Gallic War; in Systematic Progression. With a Dictionary. Third Edition, revised. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

Allen's New Latin Delectus; being Sentences for Translation from Latin into English, and English into Latin; arranged in a systematic Progression. Fourth Edition, revised. 12mo. 4s. cloth.

The London Latin Grammar; including the Eton Syntax and Prosody in English, accompanied with Notes. Sixteenth Edition. 12mo. 1s. 6d.

Robson's Constructive Latin Exercises, for teaching the Elements of the Language on a System of analysis and Synthesis; with Latin Reading Lessons and Copious Vocabularies. Fourth Edition. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

Robson's First Latin Reading Lessons. With Complete Vocabularies. Intended as an Introduction to Caesar. 12mo. 2s. 6d. cloth.

Smith's Tacitus; Germania, Agricola, and First Book of the ANNALS. With English Notes, original and selected, and Bütticher's remarks on the style of Tacitus. Edited by Dr. WM. SMITH, Editor of the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, etc. Third Edition, greatly improved. 12mo. 5s.

Terence. Andria. With English Notes, Summaries, and Life of Terence. By NEWENHAM TRAYERS, B.A., Assistant-Master in University College School. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

HEBREW.

The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament, being an attempt at a verbal connexion between the Original and the English Translation, with Indexes, a List of Proper Names, and their occurrences. Second Edition, revised. 2 Volumes, Royal 8vo. £3 18s. 6d. cloth.

Hurwitz' Grammar of the Hebrew Language. Fourth Edition. 8vo. 13s. cloth. Or in Two Parts, sold separately:—*ELEMENTS.* 4s. 6d. cloth. *ETYMOLOGY and SYNTAX.* 9s. cloth.

FRENCH.

Merlet's French Grammar. By P. F. Merlet, Late Professor of French in University College, London. New Edition. 12mo. 5s. 6d. bound. Or sold in Two Parts — *PRONUNCIATION and ACCIDENCE*, 3s. 6d.; *SYNTAX*, 3s. 6d. (*KEY*, 3s. 6d.)

Merlet's Le Traducteur; Selections, Historical, Dramatic, and MISCELLANEOUS, from the best FRENCH WRITERS, on a plan calculated to render reading and translation peculiarly serviceable in acquiring the French Language; Explanatory Notes, a Selection of Idioms, etc. 14th Edit. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

Merlet's Exercises on French Composition. Consisting of Extracts from English Authors to be turned into French; with Notes indicating the Differences in Style between the two Languages. A List of Idioms, with Explanations, Mercantile Terms and Correspondence, Essays, etc. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

Merlet's French Synonymes, explained in Alphabetical Order. Copious Examples. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

Merlet's Aperçu de la Littérature Française. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

Merlet's Stories from French Writers; in French and English Interlinear (from Merlet's "Traducteur"). Second Edition. 12mo. 2s.

ITALIAN.

Smith's First Italian Course; being a Practical and Easy Method of Learning the Elements of the Italian Language. Edited from the German of FILIPPI, after the method of Dr. AHN. 12mo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

INTERLINEAR TRANSLATIONS.

Locke's System of Classical Instructions. Interlinear TRANSLATIONS. 1s. 6d. each.

Latin.

Phaedrus's Fables of *Æsop*.
Virgil's *Æneid*. Book I.
Caesar's Invasion of Britain.

Greek.

Homer's *Iliad*. Book I.
Herodotus's *Histories*. Selections.

French.

Sismondi; the Battles of Cressy and Poitiers.

Also, to accompany the Latin and Greek Series.

The London Latin Grammar. 12mo. 1s. 6d.
The London Greek Grammar. 12mo. 1s. 6d.

HISTORY, MYTHOLOGY, ANTIQUITIES, Etc.

A History of the World, from the Earliest Records to the Present Time. By PHILIP SMITH, B.A., one of the principal contributors to the Dictionaries of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Biography, and Geography. The work will form a continuous narrative of ancient, mediæval, and modern history, instead of giving separate accounts of the several nations. It is founded on the idea of an organic unity pervading the whole course of human history. It will be written from the best authorities, ancient and modern; and, while condensed into a moderate compass, it will be so full as to be free from the baldness of an epitome. In Monthly Parts, each 2s., demy 8vo. Part I. November 1865.

* A prospectus free by post on application.

Creasy's (Professor) History of England. With Illustrations. One Volume. Small 8vo. Uniform with Schmitz's "History of Rome," and Smith's "History of Greece." (In the Press).

Smith's Smaller History of England. With Illustrations.

Fcap. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Schmitz's History of Rome, from the Earliest Times to the Death of Commodus, A.D. 192. Ninth Edition. 100 Engravings. 12mo. 7s. 6d.

Smith's Smaller History of Rome. With 79 Illustrations.

Fcap. 8vo. 8s. 6d. cloth.

Smith's History of Greece, from the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest. New Edition. 100 Engravings. Large 12mo. 7s. 6d.

Smith's Smaller History of Greece. With Illustrations.

Fcp. 8vo. 8s. 6d. cloth.

Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. By various Writers. With Illustrations. Three Volumes, Medium 8vo. Volume 1. Second Edition. £2 2s.*

* Vols. 2 and 3 completing the Work in November 1863.

Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. By various Writers. Second Edition. Illustrated by Several Hundred Engravings on Wood. One thick volume, medium 8vo. £2 2s. cloth.

Smith's Smaller Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. Abridged from the larger Dictionary. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. By various Writers. Medium 8vo. Illustrated by numerous Engravings on Wood. Complete in Three Volumes. 8vo. £5 15s. 6d. cloth.

Smith's Classical Dictionary of Biography, Mythology, and Geography. Partly based on the "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology." Fifth Edition. 750 Illustrations. 8vo. 18s. cloth.

Smith's Smaller Classical Dictionary of Biography, Mythology, and Geography. Abridged from the larger Dictionary. Illustrated by 200 Engravings on Wood. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. cloth.

Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography. By various Writers. Illustrated with Woodcuts of Coins, Plans of Cities, etc. Two Volumes 8vo. £4. cloth.

Niebuhr's History of Rome. From the Earliest Times to the First Punic War. Fourth Edition. Translated by BISHOP THIRLWALL, ARCHDEACON HARE, DR. SMITH, and DR. SCHMITZ. Three Vols. 8vo. £1 16s.

Newman (F.W.) The Odes of Horace. Translated into Unrhymed Metres, with Introduction and Notes. Crown 8vo. 5s. cloth.

Newman (F.W.) The Iliad of Homer. Faithfully translated into Unrhymed Metre. 1 vol. crown 8vo. 6s. 6d. cloth.

Akerman's Numismatic Manual, or Guide to the Collection and Study of Greek, Roman, and English Coins. Many Engravings. 8vo. £1 1s.

MENTAL PHILOSOPHY.

Ramsay's (Sir George) Principles of Psychology. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Ramsay's (Sir George) Instinct and Reason; or, the First Principles of Human Knowledge. Crown 8vo. 5s. cloth.

PURE MATHEMATICS.

De Morgan's Elements of Arithmetic.

Eighteenth Thousand. Royal 12mo. 5s. cloth.

Ellenberger's Course of Arithmetic, as taught in the Pestalozzian School, Worksop. Post 8vo. 5s. cloth.

*. * The Answers to the Questions in this Volume are now ready, price 1s. 6d.

Mason's First Book of Euclid. Explained to Beginners.

Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 9d.

Reiner's Lessons on Form; or, An Introduction to Geometry, as given in a Pestalozzian School, Cheam, Surrey. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

Reiner's Lessons on Number, as given in a Pestalozzian School, Cheam, Surrey. Master's Manual, 5s.

Table of Logarithms Common and Trigonometrical to Five Places. Under the Superintendence of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Barlow's Table of Squares, Cubes, Square Roots, Cube Roots, and Reciprocals of all Integer Numbers, up to 10,000. Royal 12mo. 8s.

MIXED MATHEMATICS.

Potter's Treatise on Mechanics, for Junior University Students. By RICHARD POTTER, M.A., Professor of Natural Philosophy in University College, London. Fourth Edition. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Potter's Treatise on Optics. Part I. All the requisite Propositions carried to First Approximations, with the construction of Optical Instruments, for Junior University Students. Second Edition. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

Potter's Treatise on Optics. Part II. The Higher Propositions, with their application to the more perfect forms of Instruments. 8vo 13s. 6d.

Potter's Physical Optics; or, the Nature and Properties of Light. A Descriptive and Experimental Treatise. 100 Illustrations. 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Newth's Mathematical Examples. A graduated series of Elementary Examples, in Arithmetic, Algebra, Logarithms, Trigonometry, and Mechanics. Crown 8vo. With Answers. 8s. 6d. cloth.

Sold also in separate Parts, without Answers:—

Arithmetic, 2s. 6d.

Algebra, 2s. 6d.

Trigonometry and Logarithms, 2s. 6d.

Mechanics, 2s. 6d.

Newth's Elements of Mechanics, including Hydrostatics, with numerous Examples. By SAMUEL NEWTH, M.A., Fellow of University College, London. Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged. Small 8vo. 8s. 6d. cloth.

Newth's First Book of Natural Philosophy; or, an Introduction to the Study of Statics, Dynamics, Hydrostatics, and Optics, with numerous Examples. 12mo. 8s. 6d. cloth.

NATURAL PHILOSOPHY, CHEMISTRY, Etc.

Lardner's Museum of Science and Art. Complete in 12^c
Single Volumes, 18s., ornamental boards; or 6 Double Ones, £1 1s., cl. lettered.

. Also, handsomely half-bound morocco, 6 volumes, £1 11s. 6d.

CONTENTS:—The Planets; are they inhabited Worlds? Weather Prognostics. Popular Fallacies in Questions of Physical Science. Latitudes and Longitudes. Lunar Influences. Meteoric Stones and Shooting Stars. Railway Accidents. Light. Common Things.—Air. Locomotion in the United States. Cometary Influences. Common Things.—Water. The Potter's Art. Common Things.—Fire. Locomotion and Transport, their Influence and Progress. The Moon. Common Things.—The Earth. The Electric Telegraph. Terrestrial Heat. The Sun. Earthquakes and Volcanoes. Barometer, Safety Lamp, and Whitworth's Micrometric Apparatus. Steam. The Steam Engine. The Eye. The Atmosphere. Time. Common Things.—Pumps. Common Things.—Spectacles.—The Kaleidoscope. Clocks and Watches. Microscopic Drawing and Engraving. The Locomotive. Thermometer. New Planets.—Leverrier and Adams's Planet. Magnitude and Minuteness. Common Things.—The Almanack. Optical Images. How to Observe the Heavens. Common Things.—The Looking Glass. Stellar Universe. The Tides. Colour. Common Things.—Man. Magnifying Glasses. Instinct and Intelligence. The Solar Microscope. The Camera Lucida. The Magic Lantern. The Camera Obscura. The Microscope. The White Ants; their Manners and Habits. The Surface of the Earth, or First Notions of Geography. Science and Poetry. The Bee. Steam Navigation. Electro-Motive Power. Thunder, Lightning, and the Aurora Borealis. The Printing-Press. The Crust of the Earth. Comets. The Stereoscope. The Pre-Adamite Earth. Eclipses. Sound.

Lardner's Animal Physics, or, the Body and its Functions
familarly Explained. 520 Illustrations. 1 vol., small 8vo. 12s. 6d. cloth.

Lardner's Animal Physiology for Schools (chiefly taken
from the "Animal Physics"). 190 Illustrations. 12mo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

Lardner's Hand-Book of Mechanics.
357 Illustrations. 1 vol., small 8vo., 5s.

Lardner's Hand-Book of Hydrostatics, Pneumatics, and
Heat. 293 Illustrations. 1 vol., small 8vo., 5s.

Lardner's Hand-Book of Optics.
290 Illustrations. 1 vol., small 8vo., 5s.

Lardner's Hand-Book of Electricity, Magnetism, and
Acoustics. 295 Illustrations. 1 vol., small 8vo. 5s.

Lardner and Dunkin's Hand-Book of Astronomy.

Second Edition. Revised. 35 Plates and 105 Illustrations on Wood. Complete in 1 vol., small 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Lardner's Natural Philosophy for Schools.

228 Illustrations. Third Edition. 1 vol., large 12mo., 3s. 6d. cloth.

Glossary of Scientific Terms for General Use. By Alexander
HENRY, M.D. Small 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Pictorial Illustrations of Science and Art. Large Printed
Sheets, each containing from 50 to 100 Engraved Figures. Complete, 9 sheets in a Wrapper, price 4s. 6d. Also in Parts (separately).

Part I. 1s. 6d.

1. Mechanic Powers.

2. Machinery.

3. Watch and Clock Work.

Part II. 1s. 6d.

4. Elements of Machinery.

5. Motion and Force.

6. Steam Engine.

Part III. 1s. 6d.

7. Hydrostatics.

8. Hydraulics.

9. Pneumatics.

PUBLISHED BY WALTON & MABERLY.

- CREASY'S (PROFFESSOR) HISTORY OF ENGLAND.** With Illustrations. One Volume. Small 8vo. Uniform with Schmitz's 'History of Rome,' and Smith's 'History of Greece' (Preparing)
- SMITH'S SMALLER HISTORY OF ENGLAND.** Illustrated. Fcap. 8vo 3s 6d cloth.
- SCHMITZ'S HISTORY OF ROME, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES to the Death of Commodus, A.D. 192** Ninth Edition 100 Engravings. 12mo. 7s 6d
- SMITH'S SMALLER HISTORY OF ROME.** With 79 Illustrations. Fcap. 8vo. 3s 6d cloth
- SMITH'S HISTORY OF GREECE, FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES to the Roman Conquest** New Edition 100 Engravings. Large 12mo. 7s 6d
- SMITH'S SMALLER HISTORY OF GREECE.** With Illustrations. Fcap. 8vo 3s. 6d cloth
- SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.** By Various Writers. With Illustrations. Two Volumes, Medium 8vo Volume 1. £2 2s
- SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITIES.** By various Writers Second Edition Illustrated by 100 Engravings on Wood One thick Volume, Medium 8vo £2 2s cloth
- SMITH'S SMALLER DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITIES** Abridged from the larger Dictionary New Edition Crown 8vo 7s 6d
- SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY and Mythology.** By various Writers Medium 8vo Illustrated by numerous Engravings on Wood Complete in three Volumes. 8vo 45 15s. 6d cloth
- SMITH'S CLASSICAL DICTIONARY OF BIOGRAPHY, MYTHOLOGY and Geography** Partly based on the "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology" Fifth Edition 750 Illustrations 8vo 18s cloth.
- SMITH'S SMALLER CLASSICAL DICTIONARY OF BIOGRAPHY, Mythology and Geography** Abridged from the larger Dictionary. Illustrated by 200 Engravings on Wood New Edition Crown 8vo 7s 6d cloth
- SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN GEOGRAPHY** By various writers Illustrated with Woodcuts of Coins, Plans of Cities, etc Two Volumes 8vo £4 cloth
- NIEBUHR'S HISTORY OF ROME.** From the Earliest Times to the first Punic War Fourth Edition Translated by BISHOP THIELWALL, ARCHDEACON HARE, DR SMITH, and DR SCHMITZ Three Vols 8vo £1 16s.
- NIEBUHR'S LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF ROME** From the Earliest Times to the first Punic War Edited by DR SCHMITZ Third Edition 8vo 8s
- DE MORGAN'S BOOK OF ALMANACS** With an Index of Reference by which the Almanac may be found for every Year whether in Old style or New, from any Epoch, Ancient or Modern, up to A.D. 2000 With means of finding the Day of New or Full Moon, from B.C. 2000, to A.D. 2000 5s cloth lettered.
- GUESSES AT TRUTH.** By Two Brothers. New Edition. With an Index Complete in One Volume Small 8vo Handsomely bound in cloth, with red edges. 10s 6d.

WORKS BY DR. R. G. LATHAM.

A HAND-BOOK OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE; for the Use of Students of the Universities and Higher Classes of Schools. Fifth Edition. 1 vol. crown 8vo, 7s. 6d. cloth.

AN ELEMENTARY ENGLISH GRAMMAR FOR THE USE OF SCHOOLS. Eighteenth Thousand. Revised and enlarged. With Chapters on Parsing and the Analysis of Sentences, and on Punctuation, followed by Exercises and Questions for Examination. Small 8vo, 4s. 6d. cloth.

A SMALLER ENGLISH GRAMMAR FOR THE USE OF SCHOOLS.
By Dr. R. G. LATHAM and Miss M. C. MABERLY. Fcap. 8vo, 2s. 6d. cloth.

AN ENGLISH GRAMMAR FOR CLASSICAL SCHOOLS. Third Edition, revised and much enlarged. Fcap. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

ELEMENTS OF COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY. 8vo.

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. Fifth Edition. Complete in 1 Vol. 8vo.

LOGIC IN ITS APPLICATION TO LANGUAGE. 12mo, 6s. cloth.

London: WALTON & MABERLY, AND LONGMAN & CO.

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF THE VARIETIES OF MAN. In 1 vol. 8vo. Illustrated, price 21s.

"The truly masculine minds of England, of Continental Europe, and of Anglo-Saxon America, prize it as the best book of its time, on the best subject of its time."
—*Weekly News*.

MAN AND HIS MIGRATIONS. In foolscap 8vo. Price 5s.

THE ETHNOLOGY OF THE BRITISH COLONIES AND DEPENDENCIES. Foolscap 8vo, 6s.

THE ETHNOLOGY OF GREAT BRITAIN. Foolscap 8vo, 5s.

THE ETHNOLOGY OF EUROPE. Foolscap 8vo, 5s.

DESCRIPTIVE ETHNOLOGY. 2 vols. 8vo, 32s.

ETHNOLOGY OF INDIA. Separate. 8vo, 16s. cloth.

London: JOHN VAN VOORST, 1, PATERNOSTER ROW.

ESSAYS—PHILOLOGICAL AND ETHNOLOGICAL.

London: WILLIAMS & NORGATE.

JOHNSON'S DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. A New Edition, founded on that of 1773, the last published in Dr. JOHNSON'S lifetime; with numerous Emendations and Additions. By R. G. LATHAM, M.D., F.R.S. To be published in Bi-monthly Parts, forming, when completed, 2 vols., 4to.

London: LONGMAN, GREEN, & CO., and other Proprietors.

